

by emanations from those guarantees that help give them life and substance."¹¹

He referred to a zone of privacy created by several constitutional guarantees. Although the *Griswold* holding is limited to a recognition of a marital right of privacy which cannot be Constitutionally invaded by a State, it seems to me that it might be extended to afford protection of privacy of the home and the recent adoption by the Congress of the so-called Cunningham Amendment which permits a householder to order the Postmaster General to issue a decree to persons sending material which in the considered judgment of the homeowner to be obscene to cease sending such material, may be a step in that direction.

EFFECTS ON CHILDREN

Another area of investigation which I hope will be most thoroughly explored by the new Commission, is the effect of obscene material upon children. The Supreme Court has told us that the law may not trample on the First Amendment rights of adults in its eagerness to protect the youth of the community,¹² and that a law which forbids the sale or distribution of materials to the general public because it is deemed harmful to, or obscene for, children, is unconstitutional on its face.¹³

We are also told by a Federal Circuit Court that the Constitution does not secure to children the same absolute right assured to adults to judge and determine for themselves what they may read and what they should reject.¹⁴ These holdings appear to me to represent a common sense construction of the Constitution, and I think it should be possible to draft a statute which will prohibit the sale, or delivery in the malls, to children under a certain specified age, of material which is described in sufficient detail to avoid the criticism of vagueness.

Such laws may well be more within the province of the States than of Congress. The States, under their police powers, have enacted many laws especially protective of children. New York State has recently taken this general approach and its statutes do not define obscenity, but rather describe in detail what is illegal for sale to minors.¹⁵

CONGRESSIONAL POWER OF PUBLICITY

Earlier, I said that Congress is limited by the Constitution in the type of legislation it can enact. However, I should also mention that Congress has available other resources which sometimes prove to be very effective aids in correcting situations. One of these

resources is the power of publicity which is given to hearings and other Congressional activities. For example, the widespread publicity given the hearings held by the Select Committee on Current Pornography Materials of the House of Representatives, in 1952, brought to the Country's attention the nature and extent of the problem of obscenity in the United States.

During the first few months of 1953, fourteen States enacted legislation to control, penalize, or change their penalties for the distribution of obscene material. Commencing last year, due to the establishment by Congress of the new Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, interest in the solution of problems caused by the dissemination of obscenity has heightened considerably.

One of the expected contributions of the new Commission will be the publicizing of the problem. The resulting give and take of ideas should prove valuable to jurists and to the public, as well as to those legislators, public officials and others who are concentrating on the problem and attempting to develop solutions.

In our discussions today, many ideas have been exchanged which are stimulating and enlightening. The talks have introduced some new ideas to me, and I imagine to others, as well, and they have also served to focus and clarify my thinking on some of the difficulties which are presented by the dissemination of obscene material.¹⁶

In discussing this very subject—obscenity—the late, great Justice Felix Frankfurter declared: "We should not burn the house down to roast the pig." I would like to add the following as a postscript: "Nor should we let that pig run wild."

By careful and objective analysis, and by well-drafted, Constitutional and clear thinking, legislation, we will be putting that "pig" right in the oven where it properly belongs.

Adding Insult to Injury

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, some 300 members of the Florida Maritime Union

recently were impelled to picket the Greek steamship *Australis* while it was in Port Everglades, Fla. I say impelled because, in the view of these American merchant seamen, the presence of the *Australis* in Port Everglades was the addition of insult to the injury which has been done to the passenger ship service of this country.

The SS *Australis* is the former SS *America*. The *America*, as the second largest liner under the American flag, served the United States in peace and war for more than 25 years. In 1964, in violation of an understanding that it would be kept in reserve until a replacement could be built, the *America* was sold to a Greek shipping company. It is now registered under the Panamanian flag and is manned, of course, by the grossly underpaid men of these foreign registered ships.

It was not enough that the *America* was sold rather than being kept in reserve as the merchant seamen of our country expected. They are now faced with the reappearance of that ship under its foreign name and flag in the ports of the United States. Here again an understanding that the former *America* would not be put into service to U.S. ports has been violated. The insult was added to the injury only 6 months after the transfer of the *America* to foreign registry and ownership, and it most recently has been brought dramatically home to us in the protests at Port Everglades.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, how long we must wait for an effective start on the rebuilding of our merchant marine and especially of our passenger liner service. It is an insult, not only to our seamen, but to our entire people, that the greatest and richest Nation on earth should content itself with a pitiable merchant marine. The least we could do is to avoid helping those who are expanding the low-wage, low-standards, foreign-flag service which has been allowed to drive our flag from the seas.

SENATE—Thursday, February 22, 1968

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Edward B. Lewis, D.D., pastor, Capitol Hill Methodist Church, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

We are aware that we are in the presence of the most high, O God, when we bow for this moment of prayer. We need the strength of prayer to stand against wicked forces. Therefore, we pray for the whole armor of God. Give us a belt of truth to tighten around our waists, a breastplate of righteousness to protect

our hearts, shoes of peace for our feet to carry a message of good tidings, and a shield of faith against the burning arrows that frustrate, humiliate, and exhaust our strength. Give to us the helmet of Thy salvation for the forgiveness of our sins and evil ways. Arm us with a sword of truth to cut through and defeat the hypocrisies and untruths of the day.

Our thanks are expressed for great men like our first President, George Washington. We remember him in word, in leadership as he also prayed and received strength through the armor of God. Be with our worthy leaders in giving like strength for this time of our Na-

tion's history. We pray in the Master's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, February 21, 1968, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26, TO 11 A.M., TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on Monday next, the Senate stand in adjournment until 11 a.m., Tuesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

¹¹ 381 U.S. at p. 484.

¹² *Bantam Books v. Sullivan* 372 U.S. 58 (1963).

¹³ *Builer v. Michigan* 352 U.S. 380 (1957).

¹⁴ *People v. Kahan* 15 N.Y. 2d 311, 312 (1965) per curiam (concurring opinion).

¹⁵ N.Y. Penal Law § 484.

¹⁶ These States were Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Texas and Wisconsin. See 18 Mercer Law Review at p. 328.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR MOSS ON TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 27

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the convening of the Senate and after the reading of the Journal on Tuesday, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] be recognized, to have the floor for up to 1 hour, and that following the conclusion of that hour, there be a period for the transaction of morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of January 24, 1901, Washington's Farewell Address will be read by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], heretofore designated for that purpose by the Vice President of the United States.

Mr. BREWSTER (at the Secretary's desk). Mr. President, it is a distinct honor to read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. BREWSTER read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot

end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding

motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are au-

thorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tender to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Re-

spect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name,

where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil, any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as

sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another a habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another, disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national pro-

pensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, deems the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with

ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied to any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of

intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fer-

vent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as a further mark of our respect, appreciation, and admiration for the Father of our Country, and under the order of yesterday, I move that the Senate stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon, Monday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana....

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1968, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, February 22, 1968

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the following communication. The Clerk read as follows:

FEBRUARY 22, 1968.

I hereby designate the Honorable CARL ALBERT to act as Speaker pro tempore today.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D. offered the following prayer:

Preserve me, O God, for in Thee do I put my trust.—Psalm 16: 1.

God of our fathers whose almighty hand has led us in the past and whose creative spirit is seeking to lead us in the present, be Thou our guardian and our guide in this hour of our national need.

Give to these leaders of our Nation and to the citizens of our land the faith, the hope, and the love which seeks to give rather than to get and standing up persists in doing something for our country rather than sitting down insists upon our country doing something for them.

We remember with humble pride the devotion of our first President whose name shines like a star in the firmament of freedom. May his courage in times of crises, his fidelity in periods of adversity, and his faith which sent him to his knees in prayer be ours as we face the hard facts of this hectic day. May the memory of his life and the consciousness of Thy presence strengthen our people and enable them to live in the spirit of good will and to labor for the good of these United States of America. In the Master's name, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of February 5, 1968, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES] to read George Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. SIKES read the Farewell Address, as follows:

To the people of the United States.

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my

services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism,—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and broth-

erly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But, as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride

of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however, powerfully they address themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter.—Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under

any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind, and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by geographical discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations: they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head: they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interrup-

tions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and containing within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true

character of governments, as of other human institutions;—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country;—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion; and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit of party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one party against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and

serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern: some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? and let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national moral-

ity can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed, extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possibly, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinions should co-operate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least, is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges to-

wards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and ex-

cessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand; neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade

a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe, my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in

cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me, a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize, without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,
17th September, 1796.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, without its being considered a precedent, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission today to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS IN ORDER UNDER CALENDAR WEDNESDAY RULE NEXT WEEK

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF FEBRUARY 26

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the purpose of asking the acting majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will be very happy to respond to the request made by the distinguished gentleman from Arizona and to inform the gentleman and our colleagues as to the program for the week of February 26.

Monday is District Day. There is one bill scheduled for consideration—H.R. 15131, to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958.

Also on Monday we will consider S. 989, Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

Tuesday we will have for consideration H.R. 11308, amending the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, we will consider H.R. 15414, the Tax Adjustment Act of 1968. This is an extension of excise taxes. This, of course, is subject to a rule being granted.

Also, S. 2419, development of cargo container vessels, under an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

This, of course, is subject to the usual reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program will be announced later.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 26

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.
There was no objection.

VA EMPLOYEES IN OKLAHOMA SUPPORT OUR FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that the Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma fully supports our fighting men in Vietnam. The employees of the VA in my home State are making every effort to give the best possible service to the men returning as veterans, but they also believe in taking the extra step—in going the extra mile. They have, therefore, established a program to show the men still serving in Vietnam that they, and their fellow Oklahomans, appreciate what they are doing for us.

The Veterans' Administration in Oklahoma has two liaison men in Vietnam. They are Millard J. Ryker, who volunteered from the Muskogee regional office for 6 months duty in Vietnam as contact representative, and 1st Lt. James R. Wolfe. The Muskogee VA office solicited their suggestions as to the wants and needs of the servicemen they contact. They are reviewing those re-

quests and are filling them to the greatest possible extent.

For example, several men returning from Vietnam have commented on the fact that the water has an extremely bad taste because of the chemicals used for purification. The returnees stated most units put Kool-Aid in the water to counteract the taste. The VA Employees' Association purchased 1,152 packages of presweetened Kool-Aid and sent it to the liaison men for distribution.

The employees have remembered that the worst burdens of war are always borne by children and have tried to at least partially offset by sending dolls and toys to Mr. Ryker for distribution to Vietnamese children.

The VA employees in Oklahoma saw to it that Christmas for our servicemen in Vietnam was not forgotten. Those employees voluntarily made candy and fruitcake for servicemen. Over 175 boxes of candy weighing in excess of 200 pounds were sent. Postage alone for the gifts was almost \$150 and was paid for by the VA Employees' Association.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that the VA employees in Oklahoma are vitally interested in showing our servicemen that they support their efforts and appreciate the sacrifices being made for us. I salute them in their endeavor.

THE DRAFT AND GRADUATE STUDENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, late last week Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey, in telegrams to all State selective service directors, announced the decision of the National Security Council that it is "not essential for the maintenance of the national health, safety, and interest" to extend student deferments for graduate study other than medicine, dentistry, and allied medical specialties. General Hershey pointed out that this action does not affect existing regulations governing deferment for graduate students who entered their second or subsequent year of graduate study in the fall of 1967. However, he informed the State directors: it "does affect students graduating from college this year, as well as those who entered the first year of graduate school last fall."

I disagree with this approach for several reasons which I will discuss here-with. Moreover, I feel the military obligations and needs can be met by effective use of our Reserve program to incorporate these students.

The view of our national military manpower needs, as determined by the National Security Council, should be re-evaluated and Congress should amend the law if administrative adjustment is not forthcoming. Otherwise, if this decision stands, the short-term effect of it upon the thousands of our universities will be the loss of those teaching assistants to undergraduates at the very time when our college and university enrollments are expanding at a substantial rate. This presents a disruptive crisis to college and university administrators

struggling with plans, and efforts to find financial resources, to cope with this expansion of college enrollment.

The longer term effect, although it will be reached within 3 years, will be to remove from the national economy the graduating corps of students trained in engineering, the social sciences, technical subjects and the other vital areas of graduate study. The requirements of our increasingly complex society dictate that every reasonable effort be made to increase our trained leadership in all areas of educational attainment. Let us continue to move forward and not be deterred from this national objective.

Another important factor is that the announcement of this decision now means that the 4,000 local draft boards will make decisions on deferment without the benefit of the national lists of critical occupations originally developed by the Departments of Labor and Commerce and will rely on "essential community need." The "essentiality" of math teachers, physicists, engineers, and other skills may be recognized in one part of the country and not in another. This is awkward planning for the Nation's needs to say the least. What is more, it leads to blatant inequities. For example, one board would defer a teaching student, while another board next door, in a specific instance that has come to my attention, would draft another student under the exact circumstances.

By no means do I feel the military obligations of these students should be unfulfilled. All male graduate students of eligible age should be required to enter a Reserve unit and develop their particular skills, with others, to eventually serve their country, either in military service or in their professional area.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that these reforms be reviewed immediately.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, February 26, 1968, at 12 o'clock noon.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 15530. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide for the purpose of entitlement to disability pension that veterans with less than 90 days service shall be taken to have been in sound condition when examined, accepted, and enrolled for service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 15531. A bill to prevent the importation of endangered species of fish or wildlife into the United States; to prevent the interstate shipment of reptiles, amphibians, and other wildlife taken contrary to State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 15532. A bill to provide for the establishment in the District of Columbia of the University of the United States to func-

tion primarily as a national institute for advanced studies at which individuals of outstanding ability will pursue studies anticipating, identifying, and isolating future problems of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15533. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for non-profit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H.R. 15534. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the valuation of a decedent's interest in a closely held business for estate tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 15535. A bill to amend section 3 of the act of November 2, 1966, relating to the development by the Secretary of the Interior of fish protein concentrate; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. SCHEUER:

H.R. 15536. A bill to amend the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by providing for a program of State-administered postsecondary vocational education scholarships; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STUBBLEFIELD (by request):

H.R. 15537. A bill to enable baby chick, started pullet, laying hen, and table-egg producers to consistently provide an adequate supply of these commodities to meet the needs of consumers, to stabilize, maintain, and develop orderly marketing conditions at prices reasonable to the consumers and producers, and to promote and expand the use and consumption of such commodities and products thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.J. Res. 1117. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the second week of May of each year as "National School Safety Patrol Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. KARTH, and Mr. ST. ONGE):

H.J. Res. 1118. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim annually the week including February 14 (the birthday of Frederick Douglass) as "Afro-American History Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H. Con. Res. 653. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to reexamine the objectives and nature of the foreign assistance programs and the relationship of such programs to vital U.S. interests; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MILLER of Ohio:

H. Con. Res. 654. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President has implied powers to take appropriate measures for the safe recovery of the crew of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and the vessel itself; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15538. A bill for the relief of Kalliroi Kapetanakis Gazulis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15539. A bill for the relief of Angero and Theophilos Kamperides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 15540. A bill for the relief of Luigi Papa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELL:

H.R. 15541. A bill for the relief of Corazon G. Santos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Kind Words for the President

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague from Fort Worth, Tex., Congressman JIM WRIGHT, addressed the "Victory, 1968" Regional Conference of the Democratic National Committee in Dallas, Tex., on February 10.

His address was warmly received by those in attendance, as he had some kind words to say about the President of the United States. His reasoned approach is something all Americans should consider as they hear the criticism of our President from all sides. I want to thank my colleague for his attempt to put the present criticism in proper perspective. The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN JIM WRIGHT TO THE REGIONAL DEMOCRATIC LEADERSHIP CONFERENCE, DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 10, 1968

Many of the Republicans who two months ago were already dividing the spoils and at least some faint-hearted Democrats who were moaning in anguish over the 1968 national election prospects appear to have forgotten entirely what took place just 20 years ago.

For almost every unfavorable portent of 1968, we can find a very nearly identical counterpart in the outlook of 1948.

The President's popularity, as measured by polls, had recently been hitting its lowest ebb. The wisecracks said he couldn't be re-elected.

The preceding elections had dealt unkindly with the Democratic party, and the President had a recalcitrant Congress.

East Coast sophisticates were mouthing in cultured tones about the President's rather plain talk and his lack of "style."

A group of Dixiecrat dissidents on the right and a self-styled "peace movement" on the left were fielding third parties in an attempt to siphon voters away from the Democratic President.

There was even a candidate named "Wallace" and a fellow in the wings named "McCarthy." How history does repeat!

In 1948, hardly anybody believed that Harry Truman had a ghost of a chance, but he came through with a smashing landslide!

It seems to me that there were three basic reasons for this resounding victory which upset all the political dopecarts and so thoroughly surprised the backroom boys.

First, the people identified with the President's plain talk and appreciated his stubborn sense of responsibility. In face of all the carping, the President did not yield to his self-appointed critics of either the right or the left—and the people liked that.

Second, even though people were not completely satisfied with the way everything was going at home and abroad, it became very apparent to the American public when the choice came right down to the wire that the Republicans were long on criticism but short on solutions.

The third reason is what we see demonstrated here today. When it looks like we're in second place, we Democrats try harder!

Today, I'd like to say a few kind words for the President of the United States—both for the awesome office which has been so aptly described as the world's most "splendid misery," and for the extraordinarily hard-

working human being who occupies that office.

Alexander Hamilton once warned of the paramount importance in a republic to guard not only against the government's oppression of its people, but also against the people's abuse of their leaders.

History shows that, as a people, we have often taken Hamilton's advice rather badly. It seems, in fact, that our strongest and best Presidents are precisely those for whom we have reserved our bitterest hostility and our rankest abuse.

George Washington upon retiring from the office wrote to a friend that he would rather be in his grave than back in the White House suffering the monumental accusations and nasty personal innuendoes to which he had been subjected.

Jefferson's detractors called him a "Jacobin" which, in the political lexicon of the time, was roughly tantamount to being branded a "socialist" or even a "communist sympathizer" today. And one newsman prophesied in passionate, purple prose that:

"The Republic is in the last stages . . . because that atheist from Virginia is in the White House."

Filthy stories were circulated about Andrew Jackson. He was falsely and blatantly accused of profiteering on government contracts, and a large segment of the eastern press adopted the practice of snidely referring to him as "King Andrew."

No President was more unmercifully reviled—in the press, in the pulpit, on the street corners, and in the Halls of Congress—than Abraham Lincoln. He was scorned by his own generals and held in contempt by some in his own Cabinet. A review of the political cartoons of Lincoln's day would make even outspoken modern presidential critics blush over their surpassing bad taste.

Both Roosevelts were targets of the most vicious attacks. In 1908, a magazine called the American Businessman featured a cover picture of Theodore Roosevelt on which had been painted a crown, and editorially accused him of betraying his oath of office and of taking us down "the dead end path to socialism." Theodore, mind you.

How well we recall, though we try to forget, the dirty, unfair things that were said about John F. Kennedy, including bitter attacks upon his personal motives. In the wake of the national trauma which followed his untimely assassination, we were shocked into a sort of temporary national shame. We seemed to realize how shabbily we had treated our finest and most dedicated President. And we repented—for a few months.

Now the hounds of the hunt are baying again. The pack is in full cry. Our quadrennial silly season or orgiastic overstatement is approaching, and like some weird masochistic cult we find among us those who would turn upon our leader and devour him.

Let me make it clear that I am not speaking of those people who criticize American policy responsibly and constructively. I am not talking of those who honestly and honorably disagree with the President on matters of opinion.

I am speaking of those who are forever assailing the President's motives, those who trade on fear and traffic in hatred. I am speaking of those who wallow in the gutter of personal abuse. I am speaking of those who superciliously set themselves above the President and sneer at his works, mistrust his words, belittle his deeds, and question his honor.

I am speaking of some urbane sophisticates who think they have discovered a safe and clever way to abuse the President's personal integrity by inventing a term they

call a "credibility gap" and chattering about it incessantly in the hope that they thus can create a climate of disbelief between the American public and its elected leadership.

I am speaking of those who gleefully try to embarrass our President internationally by thwarting fulfillment of his international commitments, in the making of which he acted under the Constitution for all of us.

Once I spoke in Congress in defense of an international commitment of President Dwight D. Eisenhower. I said at that time that we have but one President at a time, and whether or not he belongs to my party, he is my President. When he is embarrassed, I am embarrassed because my country is embarrassed.

At that time I made this analogy: If we were flying over the ocean in an aircraft—and we may not have picked the pilot—we still would not pour water in the gasoline tank just to embarrass the pilot.

I felt that way when Mr. Eisenhower was President. I felt that way when Mr. Kennedy was President. And I feel that way when Lyndon B. Johnson is our President.

President Johnson's most partisan critics should remember that it was he, as Majority Leader of the Senate, who authored and effectively carried out the responsible bipartisan policy of supporting and upholding President Eisenhower in his international dealings. Because of Lyndon Johnson's inherent sense of responsibility, there was no doubt anywhere on earth that, whatever our differences at home, this Nation faced the world united.

Never has a man come to the Presidency better grounded by experience in the intricacies of our government than Lyndon B. Johnson. Never has a man devoted himself more dutifully to the office or at greater sacrifice of his personal repose. Never has a President worked longer hours or been more deeply dedicated to the fulfillment of his promises. And never has a President kept more of his promises to the people.

For more than a generation, every American President has spoken hopefully of medical care for the aged, of equalizing educational opportunity, of fairer treatment for the minorities, and of preserving our natural heritage. It remained for Lyndon Johnson to transform those dreams into realities.

And for these efforts, he is rewarded with abuse.

The white supremacists abuse him for doing more for civil rights than any President in history; and the black power militants castigate him for not having done the impossible, immediately.

The reactionaries flay him for producing the greatest volume of social legislation in history; and the so-called "New Left" ridicules him for preserving and honoring the very institutions and processes of our constitutional system which he is sworn to defend.

The bloodthirsty hawks scorn him for not having completely devastated North Vietnam and risked the outbreak of World War III; while the timid doves abuse him for not having cravenly abandoned an ally in its mortal struggle for freedom.

One extreme flails at the President for spending too much on Vietnam and too little on domestic programs; and another attacks him for devoting too much to domestic spending and too little to Vietnam. Surely they cannot both be right. Each is too eager to criticize and too reluctant to analyze.

Any President—and certainly this President—deserves better than this. The very least we owe to any President is a modicum of understanding and an assumption of his good faith. At the very least, our propensi-

ties for partisanship and personal abuse should stop at the water's edge. In the councils of the world, he is our spokesman. If we cannot uphold him, surely we should not undermine him.

There are, in all of this, two saving graces: while Americans historically have mercilessly abused our strongest and greatest Presidents throughout their terms in office, we seldom fail to reelect them.

And those whom partisan contemporaries most bitterly vilify, history most firmly vindicates.

And so it will be, my friends, with Lyndon Baines Johnson.

The Time Has Come

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, during the past month, as Congress began its new work, notice came to me of the death in Vietnam of Sgt. Thomas B. O'Connor, son of Mr. and Mrs. Tom O'Connor, of Allendale, S.C.

Sergeant O'Connor believed in the necessity to stand with his country in this time of international crisis. He recognized the true enemy in Vietnam, and he believed so strongly in our presence there that when his regular tour with the U.S. Marines ended last year, he extended in order to remain with the men under his command and continue the fight. His death came in the spirit in which he had always lived, for the fatal wound was delivered after he had volunteered to accompany a reaction patrol, called out to aid a friendly unit under attack.

Sergeant O'Connor, as have others who died in this faraway land, brought honor to himself, his family, and his friends by the brave and distinguished service he rendered his country. Martha and Tom O'Connor have the consolation of knowing their son gave his life in the service of his country, for the cause of freedom, and to protect the people of this Nation and the free world.

The reason I address the Senate today is to invite the attention of my fellow Senators to an editorial written by the father of this son, a son we all miss, a son who symbolized all that is good and brave about our America today. Expression of the father and a picture of the son have been beautifully recorded in an editorial entitled "The Time Has Come," written by Tom O'Connor. The time has indeed come. Sometimes I fear that the time will pass before we truly rise to the occasion and meet the situation on the terms that our forefathers would have met it: Firm, resolute, and with unswerving dedication, as did this young man and all others of his breed.

This editorial by a grieving father symbolizes the hurt and pain that is felt across the broad expanse of America. I believe it contains a message which we all should hear, which we all should think about, and which we all should reflect upon. I salute Tom O'Connor and his

son, and I pray earnestly that they and their kind will prevail.

Those of us who continue to enjoy the freedoms that this young man and other service men and women have preserved for a few more years should rededicate ourselves to insure what this father and all parents ask: that they will not have died in vain.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, published in the Allendale County Citizen of January 25, 1968, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TIME HAS COME

My son came home from Vietnam early this year. When he was last here, in October, standing big, poised, confident, I guessed I would have the record cabinet all built before he came home again in February, and, secretly, I planned to refurbish the darkroom for his new interest in photography.

When I followed the honor guard up the aisle of our little church in January, I remembered that it was here he assumed one time a military stance and with measured tread marched toward the altar bearing the cross before.

There was somewhere in me, on that bitter day, a block of ice that contained and constrained all of me that could be called me. I was not cold in the sleet and rain and the wind that blew across a dark day, when the skies wept and I could not.

Just as the rifles barked sharply in a last salute and from a distance the bugle began its mournful declaration of farewell, the rain brushed coldly, softly, against my cheek.

For a moment I raised my eyes and remembered that he liked, on days such as this, to go, booted and wrapped, off across the fields into our woods.

It was then that there came to me in sharp recall, almost startling in their clarity, some words I put down on an occasion like this in another war, fifty years away, in a boy's attempt to try somehow to relieve a suffering akin to that which now held my heart in icy bond.

"When I am deaf at last to cannonades
That drum along some reach of ruined earth;
My soul withdrawn beyond the
barricades
And stopped upon my lips this present mirth;
Become, too soon, a fading, falling part
Of yesterdays, that break upon a morrow
As a remindful weeping in the heart,
Or pulse of pain, or anvil beat of sorrow;
Will you remember suddenly on streets
In throngs about the city where you walk,
Or in the country garden, where the sweets
Of summer keep the bee world full of talk,
These were the things I loved, yourself beside,
And while they are I have not wholly died?"

If I could remember this . . . if I could see again what he had seen . . . love again what he had loved . . . Then it was time to move again, to come again to the strange unrealities, of people in motion, of a world still there, and the steady beat of time going on forever.

I cannot accept my son's death as a matter of God's will. I must reject a God who would create so well and then purposely destroy. The God I reverence is a God of creation. My son was destroyed, I am afraid, by me and by you and by man's will, denying the will of God.

His own son died because of the willfulness

of man, unheeding the plea for peace on earth. For too long we have let ourselves be instruments of willful men, feeding their ambitions, their greeds, their lusts for power with the lives of our sons.

I see no sense in the present demand that we lay down our arms and thus quit the present war. For to do so would leave us defenseless, at the mercy of rapacious men who have boasted they seek our enslavement and the end of individual liberty.

With all his vaunted advancement man is still led by savage chiefs. My son's death was decreed in councils of the mighty dominated by vanities against which my God has spoken.

Only when kings and rulers and leaders of men dedicate every bit of their strengths, physical, spiritual, moral, to the end that there shall be peace on earth and among mankind an intellectual rejection of war as a solution to any problem, can it ever be said my son, and the sons of the sorrowful millions, did not die in vain.

Leonard Carriere Looks at History and Our Involvement in Vietnam

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Blue Island Sun Standard is a publication which for generations has served the community of Blue Island, Ill. One of the features of its editorial page is a column by a prominent civic leader, Mr. Leonard Carriere, who thoughtfully expresses his views on issues of the day. The February 15 issue of the Sun Standard contained the following studious commentary by Mr. Carriere on the involvement in Vietnam, which I believe reflects the type of judgment which is prevalent at the grassroots level of the country:

IN PASSING (By Leonard Carriere)

One of the "doves" has taken issue with some things I said last week about our being in Viet Nam. I repeat, that as I see it, I do not know as we have any other honorable choice. I, too, wish it were not necessary, either there or anywhere else. Such is not the case. The reasons are self evident, if we just look at the indisputable record of recent history.

At the outbreak of World War II, the Far Eastern picture had England occupying India, Ceylon, Burma and the Malay States; the French entrenched in French-Indo China (what is now North and South Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos); the Dutch in residence in Indonesia; the U.S. still in the Philippines; an independent Korea; and an Allied Nationalistic China.

Further, between them the Western European powers were in pretty solid control of the island groups in the South Pacific.

Under those circumstances there was no reason for us being in the Far East. If those circumstances were prevalent today, we would not be there. As we all know, such is not the case.

Gone are the English. Gone are the French. Gone are the Dutch, Korea, Nationalist China and just about every friend we had in the area. We are faced with a neutral India, Communist China, and the so-called independent nations, all of whom have either gone or are undergoing a process of commu-

nistic erosion. Additionally, at the outbreak of World War II, Russia was not the power she has since become, and neither for that matter was the United States.

If we were not there holding the line, what would happen would be quick and drastic, none of it conducive to our future welfare. So we are there. We are paying a stiff price but not so dear as it would ultimately be if we were not there. This makes sense to me, much as I dislike it and wish it were otherwise. I, for one, do not want to risk the alternative.

None of this has to do with partisan politics. Under any administration the results would have been the same. You can always quibble about the day-to-day conduct of our foreign affairs, but long range-wise I believe we are on the right track. Someday, in the rather distant future, there will be an answer. I do not believe many of us will be around to see what it is, but for the sake of all of those who may follow, I trust that it comes up heads.

The role of advocate of first principles is difficult. As I said, we have just begun. It will not be easy. I do not see how we can abandon the posture that was thrust upon us by the inexorable course of world events. We did not choose it in any planned manner. Yet, there is no disputing that we stand there.

Because we stand there I believe that the course of the future will not only be different, but it will be for our good and the good of the whole world. That's an easy thing to say; not all have faith in that general premise.

We could do nothing. There are some lulled into a sense of false security by this idea. That is our only other choice. For those of us who are running downhill that has an awful lot of immediate appeal. We could live our lives out without disaster overtaking us personally. That is as far as it will stretch. Somehow, and I do not know why, it is incredible that we pay some price for having been here. I do not find the price too high. It is not too difficult a task to pay not that I do not complain from time to time, we all do, yet if we do not believe in ourselves and are not willing to carry the load, a darkness will fall over us which will take a millenium to remove.

The 50th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Estonian Republic

HON. CHARLES H. PERCY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on February 24 we shall commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the Estonian Republic. The day must be remembered, for it represents a day of independence and freedom which is meaningful to all of us who live in liberty.

It grieves me and all freemen that the national sovereignty of the Estonian people was violated 28 years ago. That their national spirit has survived is evidence of the perseverance and courage of Estonians everywhere.

Let us pray that Estonian independence may once again be declared, that Estonian freedom may once again be established, that Estonian dreams of liberty may once again be fulfilled.

Amendment of the Immigration and Nationality Act

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 15506, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act.

During the 89th Congress, President Johnson signed into law the Immigration Act of 1965. This act repealed the discriminatory national origins quota system as a basis for selecting immigrants.

The Immigration Act of 1965 established a new policy governing those who seek admission to this country. The act provided an extension of the basic theme of U.S. policy—equal opportunity. The legislation stands with legislation in other critical areas such as civil rights, poverty, education, and health, reaffirming this Nation's continuing pursuit of justice, equality, and freedom.

However, when President Johnson signed the law it was only the beginning of a very important task. Serious inequities still exist in our immigration system and further amendments are needed to attain the objectives initiated in 1965.

The bill which I introduce today will effectively eliminate many of the remaining inequities in our immigration and nationalization policy and provide equal opportunity to all who desire to come to the United States.

My bill accomplishes the following objectives:

First. It refines the application of our belief in human dignity and equal opportunity under law by reestablishing a Board of Visa Appeals and a statute of limitations on deportation.

Second. It strengthens our immigration objectives to reunite families.

Third. It establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees and victims of natural calamity, and

Fourth. It provides necessary adjustments in our naturalization laws by establishing a Select Commission on Nationality and Naturalization to evaluate the fairness of our general policy in this extremely important, but long overlooked area of the public concern.

I would like to elaborate on these objectives by referring to specific sections of the bill.

Section 2 reestablishes a Board of Visa Appeals to review cases involving an immigrant visa to relatives of a U.S. citizen or of a permanent resident alien. There are numerous cases on record in which the denial of a visa by an American consul abroad raised justifiable criticism many of which cases were finally resolved by enactment of private immigration bills. To alleviate the necessity of introducing thousands of private bills each year, and eliminate the cost and expense involved, I believe that an independent Board of Visa Appeals, under law, will help assure a more equitable treatment of denial cases.

Section 5 of the bill redefines the seventh preference, currently allotted to "refugees." In place of "refugees," the seventh preference visa will be made available to desirable groups of aliens, not requiring labor certification who currently are admitted on a nonpreference basis. The availability of nonpreference visas is extremely limited, and all but precludes the admission of these aliens. Included in the new seventh preference are retired persons, private investors, fiancées of U.S. citizens, and members of religious denominations who seek admission to perform religious duties.

Section 6 of the bill establishes a new humanitarian policy of asylum for refugees. In practice, our country has always been generous in providing resettlement opportunities to refugees, but our permanent immigration law has never included a comprehensive asylum policy. Our country which is so devoted to meeting the needs of all people throughout the world should at this time fully recognize the refugee resettlement needs throughout the world. My bill is intended to accomplish this objective, first, by providing for the issuance of 12,000 immigrant visas annually to qualified refugees throughout the world; and second, by authorizing the Attorney General to parole into the country alien refugees when he determines that such action is in the public interest. This merely confirms what we have done over the last decade in admitting those who have fled from Hungary and Cuba.

Section 8 reestablishes a statute of limitations on deportation. It is an established principle of law that in the administration of justice, there must be a time limit, within which authorities must commence proceedings to punish for an alleged crime or violation of law. However, in matters involving the deportation of a lawfully admitted resident alien, this elementary principle of law does not apply. The alien may have resided in this country since childhood, or for 20 or 30 years or more. He may have been a product of our society, but he is denied its justice, and its equity under the law. The absence of a statute of limitations is a tragic shortcoming, a glaring injustice which has caused undue personal hardship and anxiety in the lives of many.

Finally section 18 of the bill provides for the issuance of special immigrant visas to clean up the backlog of petitions accumulated under the discriminatory national origins quota system. This would apply only to the fifth preference for brothers and sisters of U.S. citizens. In Italy, for example, petitions dating as far back as March of 1955 are now being processed. To provide relief for qualified fifth preference visa applicants who still wish to join their family in this country, is just and humane.

I believe that the removal of all the remaining vestiges of the national origins quota system will permit a more effective and efficient administration of our immigration laws as amended in 1965.

Mr. Speaker, on January 28, I had the opportunity to address the Nassau-Suffolk Ancient Order of Hibernians, meet-

ing on Long Island. I chose as the subject of my speech the "Immigration Law and Its Effect," particularly with regard to Ireland.

Under the terms of the Immigration Act of 1965, it was the hope of the Congress to achieve a fair and equitable immigration policy. Unfortunately, the new law in attempting to cure discrimination, saddled persons of Irish birth with an inequitable and unfair application of U.S. immigration policy. While total immigration to the United States has increased temporarily the number of persons of Irish birth permitted to enter continues to decline not because they do not wish to come here but because they are barred from entry by inequities in the law.

The statistics of Irish immigration into the United States in the last 4 fiscal years are as follows:

Fiscal year 1964.....	6,307
Fiscal year 1965.....	5,463
Fiscal year 1966.....	3,241
Fiscal year 1967.....	2,624

The American Irish community is shocked by the drastic effects of the 1965 act on Irish immigration into the United States and will receive a further shock after June 1968, when the law goes into full effect.

I join the American Irish community in expressing disappointment that a new form of discrimination has developed in the implementation of our U.S. immigration policy. How can we affirm our basic commitment toward equal opportunity to immigrate, when immigration from one country is increased by 200 percent in 1 year while immigration from another country is reduced by a similar percentage or is severely curtailed.

Mr. Speaker, England, Ireland, and Germany enjoyed a privileged position in U.S. immigration prior to 1965, partially because of the number of immigrants contributed by them in earlier years. Now residents of all nations compete on an equal basis for U.S. immigration numbers. While we eliminated the discrimination caused by national origins quotas, we should also insure that admission to the United States from all nations be available to qualified persons on a fair and reasonable basis. The standards and terms for competition must be as fair for one nation as they are for another.

It is now evident that when the Immigration Act of 1965 was passed, the House did not anticipate the effect that the new law would have on the formerly so-called "privileged countries," and in particular Ireland. Overlooked was the sociological pattern of immigration from these countries.

Ireland's sons and daughters have for decades contributed to the building and growth of this Nation in every conceivable area of endeavor. The quota which was assigned to Ireland under the old law was in small part a recognition of these contributions. The Irish do not claim a monopoly on these contributions, the sons and daughters of other nations have similarly contributed, nevertheless, the present law in its effect on Ireland is discriminatory and should be corrected.

Mr. Speaker, there is a definite need

for legislative and executive action to eliminate these inequities in our immigration laws. The American community cannot be satisfied until the discrimination is remedied.

Col. Daniel "Chappie" James, U.S. Air Force

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 21, 1968

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, a big man who stands tall for his country privileged my city of Fort Worth recently with a visit where he spoke to our local Air Force Association chapter. So impressed were all who heard him with this great patriot's appearance that the Fort Worth Star-Telegram caused an editorial to be published in honor of his visit. And the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge on February 22 will present Col. Daniel "Chappie" James with their coveted George Washington Medal for a letter he has written on his "Heritage of Freedom." It is my pleasure to include this editorial and the essay by Colonel James, along with a news account of his speech for the information of the Members of the House and readers of the RECORD:

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Feb. 11, 1968]

PATRIOT IS PILOT WHO LOVES COUNTRY

Last week was a pretty good week for people who are getting tired of the doomsayers, the prophets of gloom who are forever making headlines with their portents of anarchy and despair.

We're awfully glad Air Force Col. Daniel (Chappie) James Jr. came to town. He showed us that unabashed patriotism is still in style.

In case you missed the news stories, Colonel James is a big man who stands mighty tall for his country. He is a 48-year-old Negro pilot who has flown fighter planes in three wars and who two years ago led the "Bolo" mission in which seven Communist planes were destroyed—the biggest bag for a single unit on any day of the Vietnamese war.

"I couldn't live long enough to pay this country back what I owe it," the colonel told an interviewer. "I've fought in three wars, and three more wouldn't be too many more to defend this country. I love America and if she has weaknesses and ills, I'll hold her hand."

How good to hear the joyous emotion of a man who knows what he's fighting for!

Colonel James called for unity of purpose in his address to the Air Force Association here. It was announced at the same time that he had won a top award from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge for his essay on "Heritage of Freedom."

His essay asks us to turn a deaf ear to strident and divisive harangues and, instead, to become in our daily lives unflinching links in the chain of unity and freedom that has been the strength of our country. "We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other," the colonel says.

He is declaring that patriotism is more than bombs. He is saying that it means holding fast to what is good, and defending it. "If anyone wants to challenge America, they've got me to run over first," he said. We have a feeling no one is going to run over Chappie James.

Some other cheerful things happened last week.

There was the student poll at University of Texas at Arlington that indicated pretty strongly that college kids aren't thronging the road to perdition via drugs and sex, and that they are not fainthearted about protecting the nation and its freedoms.

The opinion sampling revealed that students at UTA pretty much hold that same views on sexual freedom that their parents did a generation ago—that is to say, a solid majority holds license to be dangerous. Also, the poll showed that eight out of 10 students belong to a formal religious group.

The hippies may not be taking over so fast as some people thought.

Also last week, there was the news that U.S. unemployment dipped last month to 3.5 per cent of the labor force, the lowest figure since November 1953. Unemployment of 3.5 per cent is getting close to what the experts call the "irreducible minimum."

Polls and statistics don't tell the whole story, of course, but good statistics are better than bad statistics.

This country has problems, and it would be foolish to deny them. But things happened last week that show we must be doing some things right.

[From the Fort Worth (Tex.) Star-Telegram, Feb. 9, 1968]

COLONEL JAMES' ESSAY ON AMERICA

(NOTE.—Col. Daniel (Chappie) James Jr. who called for unity in purpose Thursday night in an address to the Air Force Association at Carswell Air Force Base, also received one of the top awards Thursday from the Freedoms Foundation of Valley Forge.

(The Air Force colonel received the George Washington Honor Medal and a \$100 prize for a letter he wrote on his "Heritage of Freedom.")

(The essay is reprinted here in full.)

(By Col. Daniel James, Jr.)

The strength of the United States of America lies in its unity. It lies in free men blessed and ordained with the rights of freedom working to provide, build, enjoy and grow.

Those who would subvert us, or any free people, try to disrupt this unity by breaking the small parts from the whole, driving in wedges of fear and discontent.

I am a Negro and, therefore, I am subject to their constant harangue.

They say, "You, James, are a member of a minority; you are a black man."

They say, "You should be disgusted with this American society, this so-called democracy."

They say, "You can only progress so far in any field that you choose before somebody puts his foot on your neck for no other reason than you are black."

They say, "You are a second-class citizen."

My heritage of freedom provides my reply. To them I say, I am a citizen of the United States of America.

I am not a second-class citizen, and no man here is unless he thinks like one, reasons like one, or performs like one.

This is my country and I believe in her—and I believe in her flag—and I'll defend her—and I'll fight for her and serve her. If she has any ills I'll stand by her and hold her hand, until in God's given time, through her wisdom and her consideration for the welfare of the entire nation, things are made right again.

Today's world situation requires strong men to stand up and be counted, no matter what their personal grievances are. Our greatest weapon is one we have always possessed, our heritage of freedom, our unity as a nation.

We must stop finding so many ways to hate each other because of race, creed, religion, political party or social strata.

We must stop using personal grievances as an excuse to break the laws of the land.

We must not join with any lawless mobs, no matter what the provocation, in disregard for law and order.

A thief is a thief, I don't care what he gives for his reason for stealing.

A mob is a mob. I don't care what the provocation is.

We can't afford it in this great country of ours. It is our responsibility to preserve our freedom and our unity. Great thinking men must help unite those with whom they come in contact through hard work and participation. Our contributions to the total effort can be a by-product of what we achieve through excellence in our chosen field. In our daily lives we must become a strong link in the chain of unity and freedom that has always been the strength of the United States of America.

I am an American. My heritage is bound by the tenets of freedom inherent in that simple statement.

My responsibility is to allow my children to join a community of free people everywhere who have the right to say, "I am what I am because I have the freedom to say it."

Freedom Day Rally

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I insert into the RECORD a speech made by our distinguished colleague, JOHN R. RARICK, of Louisiana, at a Freedom Day Rally at Taipei, Formosa, on January 23. The rally was held under the auspices of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League, an organization providing leadership throughout Southeast Asia in the struggle against the oppressive forces of communism:

FREEDOM DAY RALLY

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, and fellow free citizens of the world.

I speak to you as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, and as a voice for millions of my fellow Americans who believe in individual liberty under God.

You have won the moral support of the American public in your courageous struggle against the oppressive tyranny of the Communist dictators in Peking. We—the American people—stand shoulder-to-shoulder with you in a worldwide crusade for individual liberty, peace and self-determination.

Although I speak to you as an individual Member of the United States Congress rather than as an official representative of my Government, let me emphasize that there is a strong public feeling for the rightful cause of free China—which is revealed many times by American citizens across our country and is reflected in the political battles within our Government.

I can tell you that the vast majority of the people of the United States maintain their friendship for the legitimate government of the Chinese people here in Taipei, and recognize it as the only true voice for all the Chinese people.

The American public knows, as you do, that atheistic communism is the immoral enemy of free men; that communism threatens not only the nations bordering on her territory, but every free-world government, and every decent institution.

The much-publicized differences of opinion between Peking and Moscow must never be

permitted to obscure the truth that every Communist government is a threat to peace and liberty, and that each is primarily dedicated to expanding Communist aggression by armed forces or subversion—not in disagreeing with each other. The people of the free world must recognize this fact.

When Captive Nations Week was first observed in the United States in 1959, Khrushchev displayed public anger, as have his successors, since this focused world attention to a basic weakness of the Red empire—the unconquerable spirit of the captive peoples.

The propaganda voices in Peking have been equally vigorous in denouncing rallies and programs such as the one in which we are participating here today, since they are aware of the tremendous unrest of the people of the mainland for restoration of fundamental liberties which the Communist regime cannot and dare not provide.

Since communism is fundamentally evil in its political, social, and economic principles, it has within itself the seeds of self-destruction which must be carefully nourished by we people working together with anti-Communist allies throughout the world.

You, the free Chinese people are among the leaders in the gallant struggle against communism on the Asian front—and rightfully so. Determination and true faith such as yours is a must on every continent and in every nation as free people battle the Red cancer.

The endless struggle of heroic people long held in painful bondage behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains can best be seen in the agricultural failures under Communist governments, since farmers, traditionally independent, do not produce to the best of their ability under any form of collective or communal farm system.

I want you to know that the American people do not support those few leaders of the free world who naively parrot the Communist co-existence line. We remind any free world leader who is tricked by the diabolical propaganda for co-existence, that the expansion of world communism is directly related to the blackmail concessions obtained by the Soviets at the Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences.

For example, General de Gaulle has demonstrated a shocking misconception of foreign affairs, first in recognizing Peking, and recently taking sides with Moscow during the Arab-Israeli crisis. Fortunately, few leaders of the free world are as blundering or misled as De Gaulle.

I have just returned from Africa where I visited Rhodesia, Portuguese Angola, and the Republic of South Africa. I met with their leaders and saw firsthand the Communist weapons and material being used against the people of these free nations by the Marxist-trained and armed terrorists—many of whom are the exploited graduates of murder schools in Peking, Moscow and Cuba.

They are indiscriminate as to their victims—black, white or yellow—their methods are fear and revolution by internal collapse, and loss of confidence in the governing leaders. The people in those countries I visited actually consider themselves in an economic war with international communism, which is giving every indication of an attempt to establish colonial outposts in many so-called emerging nations in Africa. Strange indeed that those who scream colonialism, imperialism and exploitation the loudest are the ones hardest bent on bringing about that condition.

In Guatemala, last week, two of our U.S. military officers assigned to the consul's office were machine-gunned to death in broad daylight by Communist terrorists merely because they disliked U.S. intermeddling in their country as military advisers to protect the citizens of that republic. In Guatemala, over the past 18 months there have been an estimated 1,000 assassinations and murders

attributed to Red-trained murderers. A most unbelievable and unconscionable method to bring about any progress or liberty. And as the attacked government in power tightens its security and law enforcement, we hear the Communist Party line "police state"—the police state, if such exists have been caused by, and is a result of, the Communist-provoked terrorism.

We know that the Communist world suffers from tremendous internal complications, both ideologically and economically. We must, therefore, apply every effective external and internal pressure to exploit their problems and bring about the collapse of their system.

As the Communist world struggles to avoid collapse it is sheer folly for the free world to rescue them by diplomatic or economic concessions, be they called humanitarian or for the relief of poverty. The way we can truly end the suffering of the colonized victims of communism is not to subsidize their governments, but to hasten their leaders' collapse through shortages in food, money and popular support.

We must understand that any success for communism anywhere on the globe is damaging to freedom throughout the world; likewise a defeat for communism in any part of the globe advances the cause of liberty throughout the world. Therefore, we must continue to refuse to recognize the illegal government of Mao Tse Tung and think only of the restoration of free governments in every country where communism today exists. The diplomatic boycott of the illegal Peking rulers must continue.

As a result of the efforts by the brave citizens of South Viet Nam and her anti-Communist friends, the aggression sponsored by Mao Tse Tung and his co-conspirator—the Soviet Union—the military and people of Indonesia were inspired to overthrow the Peking-infiltrated dictatorship of Sukarno, and International Communism suffered a great loss of face as Indonesia rejoined the Free World.

The success of the struggle for individual liberty in Viet Nam, the firm defense of Korea, and the continuing activities of Eastern European leaders in exile, are all helpful to your hopes to free your mainland homes, just as your determined advances are helpful to the long suffering opponents of Communism in all other areas.

When our last great military leader, General Douglas MacArthur returned home from the Korean War, he pointed out—and I quote—"the very purpose of war is victory." The logic of that statement is evident.

The constant struggle against Communism in which we are engaged must and will end in victory for freedom. Every economic, diplomatic, and psychological weapon at the disposal of the Free World must be employed in the struggle for true world peace, through victory over Communism.

The turmoil on the mainland is evidence of the inevitable collapse of the Communist dictatorship. It is only a matter of time. We know that the deep-seated moral traditions of the Chinese people can never be crushed by the imposition of the false ideology of communism with its broken promises and disproved theories. The massive propaganda of Mao's puppets and hirelings together with his fear and intimidation hasn't been able to convince the people of mainland China that the philosophy of the Communists is right or workable. Any form of government which brutally oppresses and exploits hundreds of millions of people is doomed to dismal failure. Our task is to work together in a united effort to hasten that collapse.

The near future will restore the legitimate government for all China. Your perseverance and courage will have its reward of sweet victory. I am confident that the free peoples of the world will awaken and totally reject communism, and that in continued cooperation

and mutual understanding between the free Chinese and the people of the United States together with others joining our efforts, legitimate world freedom and a lasting peace can be achieved within our lifetime.

Our voices, our wants, our goals are being heard! Truth and freedom crushed to the earth can but rise again.

The Government of Nationalist China is a staunch ally and brings strength and stability to our posture in Southeast Asia. It was most fitting that the American people were so prominently represented at the rally. Other speakers were C. K. Yen, Vice President of the Republic of China and Ku Cheng-kang, chairman of the Asian Peoples' Anti-Communist League. A message from President Chiang Kai-shek was read to those gathered at the rally.

Carmine "Pop" Coppola

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, it was an honor for me to attend a dinner at the Claridge Restaurant, in Brooklyn, N.Y., on Saturday, February 10, 1968, sponsored by the Honorable Charles P. De Martino, executive member of the Democratic Party of the 51st Assembly District in Brooklyn, N.Y. The dinner was in honor of Mr. Carmine Coppola, called by his many, many friends "Pop Coppola," who had been a leader in his community and a "captain" in the 51st Assembly District for 50 years. Mr. Coppola who is 79 years old is still working for the principles in which he believes, those of the Democratic Party. He endeavors, as he says, to "do what he can for his country."

There were many friends of Mr. Coppola at the dinner, many of whom he had helped to achieve public office, many who came to the dinner simply to honor a great man. Those on the dais were Hon. James V. Mangano, Hon. Beatrice Judge, Hon. Ceil Holton, Hon. Charles P. De Martino, Hon. HUGH CAREY, Hon. Joseph S. Levine, Hon. William J. Ferrall, Hon. John F. Furey, Hon. Thomas J. Cuite, Hon. Ross J. DeLorenzo, and many clergy.

A tribute should be given to Hon. Charles P. De Martino and Hon. Ceil Holton for their excellent organization of the dinner and to Hon. Harold Rosenbaum for chairing the dinner.

It is therefore with pride that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and bring to the attention of my colleagues the remarks made by the guest of honor, Mr. Carmine Coppola:

Honorable guests, ladies and gentlemen, fellow party members, friends:

I would like to thank each and every one here for the honor that you pay me.

It is with a happy heart that I speak to you tonight.

It is difficult for me to express what 50 years membership in the party has meant to me. I have seen many of the sides of life.

I have seen victory, and I have seen defeat;

I have seen courage and I have seen cowardice;

I have seen happiness and I have seen sorrow;

I have seen pride and I have seen humility;

I have seen gratitude and I have seen ingratitude;

I have seen love and I have seen hate;

But probably the best way to sum up what the years have given me is the evidence before me right now—it is one of the greatest gifts that one man can give another, and that is the gift of "friendship."

Job Corps Offers Youth a New Chance in Life

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, the Los Angeles Times recently devoted part of its women's news section to a very interesting account of how the Job Corps has helped three young ladies begin life anew. It makes encouraging reading, and I would like to share it with my colleagues:

JOB CORPS GUIDES THREE TRAINEES TO A NEW WAY OF LIFE

(By Donna Scheibe)

PASADENA.—Women in Community Service (WICS) started off the new year with a success.

It was a triumphant success, one which WICS recruiters at 136 Madison Ave. have waited a year for. It has been that long since they put their first frightened young applicants on the bus to be trained for a new life.

Three of them on home leave visited Alma Williams and Mrs. Charles Chase, who screened them, to show how the Job Corps reshaped their lives.

MOVING EXPERIENCES

The girls leave little doubt that they have been through some moving personal confrontations to arrive at this point.

Roseanne Begay, 20, is a Navajo who had only an eighth grade education, no close relatives and a job as a live-in baby sitter. She faced life as a domestic and nothing more.

At no time had anyone discovered she had a fine singing voice, an exceptional sense of good taste in design and ability to sew.

"I found it out by myself, the best way," she says in reviewing her first year at the Albuquerque, N.M., Job Corps center.

She is a member of a church choir in Albuquerque, can tailor a suit and hopes to earn her way through a school of design—"One I'll pick out myself." She is an experienced data computer operator. She is also working toward a high school diploma.

All three girls are filled with terms such as GED and OJT. They halt conversation in answer to explain that GED relates to general education study and that OJT is on-the-job training and that each of them is receiving it. And proudly, that RA (residential aide) is an honor.

Collette Webb, 17, and Hortensia Navar, 19, have both been RAs. Each has served as not only an aide to the Job Corps director at her residence hall but as a judge for council of RAs at the center.

The halls are former U.S. Army barracks in Tongue Point, the Astoria, Ore., center to which Collette and Hortensia have been assigned.

LONELINESS RECALLED

Each of them recalls her loneliness and her disappointment at the barren surroundings when the Job Corps bus first reached the base.

"It rains in Oregon. Boy, does it rain," said Collette. "All the time—day and night. It gets to you—especially when you're new there."

But coming from a household with 12 children, Collette had to share her room with only one other girl. That, at least, was something.

Also, she had an allowance, half of which she could send home if she chose. With only a working mother supporting the brothers and sisters at home it was a brighter prospect.

And life at Tongue Point gave her the ultimate one can find at 17. Combining an almost harsh candor, bred of being black and poor at the same time, and a high intelligence no one had ever pointed out before, Collette discovered she is a leader.

LOOKS LIFE IN EYE

She not only looks life in the eye honestly for herself but expects the girls in her residence and study halls to do the same.

"If they fight, if they don't get along, they're severed," she says bluntly. "They volunteered. They wanted a chance. They better take it."

Smartly dressed in a wool knit suit she bought with her allowance she is unlike many in her old Blair High School who have had twice her chances at life. She knows exactly where she is going—into the Marine Corps—taking training and experience as a secretary with her.

Hortensia, 20, has made the biggest jump of all. Also from a family of 12 children, she spoke no English when she came to Lincoln High School, Los Angeles, from her home in Mexico.

Domestic service would have been her lot, except for a driving ambition and a determination to speak English and speak it well.

She does. And early in her first weeks at Tongue Point she showed an exceptional ability at manual skills. She can run the mimeograph machine, type 90 words a minute, operate the switchboard and has a vocabulary superior to that of many average Americans.

Roseanne went back to Albuquerque early. Without a family in California she had no reason to stay. "After you get over the first loneliness at the center, then it's sort of like the Army," she said. "Home is where you are and what you make it."

Hortensia yearns for home life. "I love the home and family parts of our study," she said.

CHANCE SEEN

Collette sees in home and family study hours a chance for Collene, her twin, who cannot join the corps because she has a small baby.

Collette has already broached the subject in Oregon of having girls in home and family studies care for job corps children while the young mothers study.

Somebody must have been listening—a pilot center has started for that purpose in Pennsylvania.

The "Pueblo": How Long?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, this is the 31st day the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and her crew have been in North Korean hands.

A Joint Congressional Committee To Study Foreign Aid

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, our able colleague, Representative EDWARD J. GURNEY, of Florida, introduced this week a resolution to establish a joint congressional committee to evaluate and recommend changes in the foreign aid program. I commend the gentleman for his action and urge that prompt and favorable consideration be given the proposal. I am today introducing a similar measure. It is certainly time that a thorough reevaluation of our foreign aid purposes and programs be carried out. Recent disclosures of waste, inefficiency, and some corruption in connection with foreign aid activities only accentuate the need for a long overdue study of this area. The concern over foreign aid mismanagement is typified, I believe, by the following editorials, one of which appeared in the February 18 edition of the Salt Lake Tribune, and the other in the February 20 edition of the Washington Star:

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Feb. 18, 1968]

MUSTY AID CORNERS NEED VENTILATING

Charges of waste in the U.S. foreign aid program gain substance with recent findings of wide-ranging implications. The latest disclosure that \$250,000 in Agency for International Development funds were used to buy luxury "cocktail party" items in Santo Domingo is not the worst.

Reports from Washington tell of questionable AID spending totaling well over one million dollars. Investigations by AID's own inspector-general, U.S. Senate committees and some capital newsmen implicate AID officials and foreign contractors in either careless or corrupt transactions.

Allegations so far made public accuse Japanese and Dutch contractors of collecting \$300,000 in overcharges against AID accounts and cite European firms, one identified as Belgian, for charging some \$600,000 on fictional repairs to equipment heading for other AID recipient countries.

Investigators are also reported to have found that some AID officials enjoyed favors and expensive entertainment provided by those eventually awarded AID contracts. And at least one such contract was allegedly assigned to an American company whose most valuable assets were friends in high places. Indeed, many of the American principals being mentioned have personal connections as high as the vice president's office.

One sleuth hard on AID's trail, Senator John J. Williams (R-Del.), accuses the Justice Department of deliberately hiding information of what he considers would be a first class scandal if made public.

Herbert J. Waters, a former assistant to Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, previously headed AID's Office of Material Resources and resigned as the organization's "war on hunger" chief just before a Senate committee issued statements like, "... it is evident that for many years the agency's top management has been uniquely resistant to ... acting on ... evaluations which contain critical comments of program operations." However, Waters says he helped instigate the present probe and that he is prepared to assist investigators in every way.

The amount of foreign aid money char-

acterized so far as misspent is small compared to AID's two billion dollar annual budget and there is a possibility much of it mistakenly dispensed can be recovered. However, even one dollar going to the wrong pocket is theft, and just how badly the American taxpayers have been plundered will be known only when this matter is thoroughly aired.

As part of the nation's defense program, financial and material assistance to foreign countries is vital. The amount of money involved is bound to attract predatory types. It now seems time to weed them out, whoever and wherever they are. The current investigation should proceed with ample cooperation from every government agency involved.

[From the Washington Star, Feb. 20, 1968]

TIME FOR AN OVERHAUL

Examples of waste, inefficiency and irregularities in the nation's foreign aid program have long since become a twice-told tale, with nothing ever seeming to be done to put things straight. One must hope, however, that the latest cases in point—some ludicrous, some shocking—will stir up enough indignation in Congress to lead to corrective action.

The cases, numbering over 50, have been reported to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by the State Department's Office of Inspector General. They include—apart from questionable official conduct in the Agency for International Development—such happenings, or non-happenings, as the following: A costly administrative slip-up resulting in the shipment by air, instead of by ocean freighter, of 150 tons of bridge components from Tokyo to Bangkok; the expenditure of \$100,000 for water service in Saigon to vessels that never received a drop; and the sudden discovery that 18 large crates of tools, marked for delivery to Paraguay, had gathered dust for nine years on a Buenos Aires dock.

Pennsylvania's Senator Hugh Scott is pressing for legislation to tighten up AID's operations to lessen the likelihood of future absurdities of this kind. "The program," he says, "is very much in need of an overhauling to protect the taxpayer." A hearty amen to that.

Higher Education in Law Enforcement

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, a modern professional police force is desired by everyone in this country. Crime cannot be combated effectively unless our police are encouraged to achieve a higher degree of professionalism in crime prevention.

I do not believe that anyone would contest these statements. However, in the District of Columbia policemen and firemen's pay raise bill that is to be considered in the House, provisions for educational and recruitment incentives for the policemen have been eliminated. Is there any valid argument for eliminating these provisions? How can any city deny incentives for their officers to acquire higher education in law enforcement? And how can we, knowing how undermanned the District police force is today, not provide some minimal recruitment incentives to encourage men to come to this city to work.

To quote Herbert J. Miller, Jr., Chairman of the District of Columbia Crime Commission:

It is an understatement that an upgrading of the educational background of law enforcement officers is urgently needed.

I should like to submit for all my colleagues the full text of Mr. Miller's letter. He concisely states the case.

The letter follows:

LAW OFFICES, MILLER, MCCARTHY,
EVANS & CASSIDY,
Washington, D.C., February 6, 1968.

Congressman GIL GUDE,
Congressman BROCK ADAMS,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMEN: Having reviewed your proposal to increase the annual salary of Police Officers of the Metropolitan Police Department who have achieved certain educational levels in the law enforcement field, I am happy to heartily endorse this proposal. It is an affirmative, positive step toward a professionalization of the law enforcement officer. It is an understatement that an upgrading of the educational background of law enforcement officers is urgently needed.

I also endorse the balance of the proposal enabling the government to pay travel expenses and per diem in conjunction with recruiting activities—at least so long as the Metropolitan Police Department is unable to attract a sufficient number of recruits to fill its authorized strength.

Sincerely yours,

HERBERT J. MILLER, JR.

Can Federalism Survive?

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, our distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, spoke at the National Canners Association Convention in Atlantic City recently.

Members of the association who were deeply impressed with the excellent presentation he made of the issues facing our Nation at this time, have made a copy of his speech available to me.

As I, too, am impressed with this excellent analysis of the facts all of us must face in 1968, I welcome this opportunity to extend my remarks in order that I might include the text of his speech in the RECORD:

CAN FEDERALISM SURVIVE?

(By the Honorable MELVIN R. LAIRD, U.S. Representative from Wisconsin)

I'm glad to have this opportunity to visit with the Board of Directors to discuss some of the major problems which are facing the Second Session of the 90th Congress, problems that face every American in this great country of ours.

In my district in Wisconsin everything grows. About a third of the cranberries produced in this country come from that particular district. We are developing a tremendous canning industry in that area. It's one of the fastest growing canning areas in America today. I think the canning industry has to do a better job in 1968 and in 1969 as we face the decades of the 70's in telling people that in the United States of America today, food is our best buy.

Many people do not realize the advancements that have been made in marketing demanded by consumers all over the United States. We hear a lot of talk about consumer protection. Consumers have made the decision as far as the market place is concerned from one end of this country to the other. We had some poultry here today. Do you realize that poultry is selling today at about half the price of 10 years ago? Any person going in any market place in America today can buy that product more cheaply than it sold just 10 years ago today.

When you look at the canned products that we have on our shelves all over the United States, it makes me wonder whether we should continue going on the defensive in the food and marketing business.

Although there is not going to be very much major legislation passed in this session of the Congress, as I look at my crystal ball, this area of food legislation will be one of the most important areas of concern in the Congress during the next four to five years. Within the next 30 days, there will be a new reorganization announced about the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service. There will be a new move to merge these activities under one head in an area which will bring together the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service for the first time in a very close working relationship.

The power and the authority of the Food and Drug Administration and the Public Health Service will be greatly enlarged in this reorganization program which will be submitted by the President. It has been my privilege to have a briefing on this reorganization, by the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, Mr. Gardner, and this will be a massive reorganization of this important department which has so much to do with the future development of the canning industry and food marketing in the United States.

We're going to have legislation, and my good friend, Hyde Murray, I understand, gave you a very detailed report on the legislation this morning at your breakfast. I understand he traced through some of the major bills that will be considered by the House and Senate Agricultural Committees as well as the Senate and the House itself.

You all heard the President's State of the Union Message this last Wednesday night in which he outlined his recommendations for new bargaining power in the hands of individual farm and farm groups and I am sure that none of you were misled to think that he was talking about S. 109, the bill that has passed the Senate of the United States. You know and I know that he was not talking about that legislation. He was talking about a new farm bargaining bill which will be submitted to the House Agriculture Committee and the Senate Agriculture Committee completely revised, within the first few weeks of February.

No, we have major challenges in this session of Congress which probably will put much of this legislation on the back burner for six to nine months. Your concern and your opportunity during this six to nine months, perhaps even 18 months, is to understand fully how important this legislation is—whether it be in the area of taking over all inspection requirements or making you provide full and complete detailed reports on every recipe you have in terms of ingredients and all the way down the line. This is in the offing unless you use this nine to 18 month period to do a better job in getting your point of view across to members of Congress, members of the Senate and to the consumer.

You have this time, you've been given this time through a very unfortunate occurrence, and of course that unfortunate occurrence is the war in Vietnam. This has delayed many major pieces of legislation. It has delayed the

expansion of the Food and Drug operation and the Public Health operation. In the United States Department of Agriculture plans have come to somewhat of a standstill as far as the over-all planners are concerned because the United States of America in this year 1968, faces the most crucial economic crisis in the history of our country. We simply can't do everything for everybody and still fight a war. Whether consumer or canner or farmer, whether it's the housewife in the kitchen or the farmer in the field or the worker in the factory—all of these people are going to have to be willing to make some hard, tough economic decisions. They are all going to have to be able and willing to make some sacrifices if we want a bright economic future in the period of the 1970's.

Today's situation reminds me of an airline pilot who was flying across the United States. It was foggy out and the passengers were very concerned because as they looked out their portholes, they could neither see the wingtips to the port side or the starboard side of the airplane. Finally, the pilot came over with a rather reassuring voice and he said, "I have two things to report. One is good news and the other is bad news. I would like to give you the bad news first. The bad news is that we are lost. The good news is that we are making record time."

This is the problem that faces the United States economically in this year, 1968. The bad news is that we are lost, we're not finding the right answers for the problems of our cities and depressed rural areas, for the problems of health, education, and welfare, for the balance of payments, inflation, high interest rates, crime and so on. But we're making record time as far as spending ourselves silly and cheapening the value of the dollar and creating more and more programs that don't seem to work are concerned.

That's why I suggested that you in the canning industry and all of us must be willing to tighten our belts, must be willing to make the sacrifices in this year 1968, although they are awfully tough sometimes to make. This is why the major issue facing this Congress is the economic issue, because the prosperity of the United States and every citizen in it is threatened in this year 1968 as it has never been threatened before. This Congress must be willing to make the hard, tough decisions that have to be made as far as matching revenue with expenditures and exposing the kind of gimmickry that is being used in this budget document which has been submitted on an informal basis to the Congress this last week.

We saw the deficit sort of melt from \$33 billion for this fiscal year, 1969 by a kind of manipulation which every international banker and every economist recognizes on its face as deliberate misleading assumptions in order to cover up where this country is actually going. Five billion of that deficit disappeared because the social security trust fund which is now counted in the regular budget for the first time shows that much of a surplus. In addition to that, the President shows us \$12.5 billion worth of taxes in the revenue column on the assumption that Congress will pass his tax bill.

He also takes for the first time \$6 billion out of defense procurement funds through a transfer process to cover the current obligations of the war in Vietnam—money that will have to be put back either through a supplemental appropriation or in later budgets. This is the way that the deficit is cut down to \$8 billion in this document that will be submitted to us on the 29th of January. Social Security receipts for the first time and Social Security taxes as you all know, are all going up this year; the payroll tax, the tax rate all is increased and the trust fund expenditures will be \$46 billion, but trust fund receipts, unemployment compensation, Social Security, trust fund and

highway trust fund amount to \$52.5 billion in the fiscal year 1969.

Where does that balance because of the increased tax rates go? It goes over to help pay and finance the old administrative budget in fiscal year 1969. The war in Vietnam is costing \$30 billion a year, yet in the 1968 budget only \$21.7 billion was provided. The war costs in Vietnam have been underestimated in each of the last two years; in fiscal year 1966 by \$10.8 billion; in fiscal 1967 by over \$13 billion and all of these costs are coming home to haunt the United States of America. Regardless of the kind of manipulation that is used in this budget document, the time has come when we're going to have to be willing to stand up and pay for some of these costs on a current basis.

Although a majority of my colleagues in the Congress of the United States have not been convinced that a case has been made for a tax increase, I for one am willing to support that tax increase because we cannot have deficit financing to the extent that we have it in the United States of America today and expect to have any bright future as far as economic growth and development in the United States is concerned.

We can't be unwilling to pay the cost, we can't just ask a few people in our society to make sacrifices like our servicemen are making for us in Vietnam today. This has to be a cross to bear, that everyone has to share to some extent in bringing revenues and expenditures more nearly in line. Because the gimmicks will run out in the year 1970. These gimmicks may be good for 1969 in the budget document that is submitted in just three weeks, but my friends in the canning industry, every one of those gimmicks that is used in this budget presentation, can never be used again.

It seems to me that the Congress in making and working and living up to its responsibility must be willing to make the hard, tough decisions in the area of expenditure reductions first and that has to be the high priority item in this second session of the 90th Congress. But we will also have to be willing to face up to the revenue side of this budget so that we're not in a position of passing these bills on to some future group.

The future of federalism is involved in this whole debate. There are really four overriding issues that face America in this year 1968 and as we look to the next few years. They are Peace, Prosperity, Credibility in Government and the Future Course of Federalism.

Peace is an issue because we are once again at war. It is also an issue here at home because of the turbulence on our city streets. Americans would do anything honorable to bring about a lasting peace both at home and abroad. But on both fronts, Americans are frustrated and confused. Where we are going, what we are doing, what we hope to accomplish is unclear and uncertain both concerning Vietnam and the breakdown in our society.

Americans long, for firm leadership on both fronts. We want to be told where we are going and what we are doing to get there. In Vietnam, we are told the object is negotiations. But negotiations do not necessarily mean peace or an end to the war. We must not forget the Korean experience. More than two-thirds of the Americans who were killed in Korea died after negotiations began. Until our true purpose is brought into sharp focus by our national leaders, the raging debate on the issue of peace will continue to grow.

Prosperity is an issue because it is threatened. The cost of living, which has eaten up most of the wage increases Americans have won, threatens to climb another 5.5 percent in the next 15 months. Interest rates are the highest in this century. Social Security taxes have been increased and the Johnson Administration has asked Congress to raise taxes another 10 percent in

this Session of Congress. The Balance of Payments crisis has led the President to restrict American business investments overseas and to request controls on tourist travel.

The spending issue dominated the last Session of Congress and it will dominate this Session. The root of our economic problems lies in a failure to set priorities among the hundreds of demands for federal dollars. We have been operating on a theory of "fight now and finance later" the war in Vietnam. At home the theory has been "finance now and perfect later" domestic programs in areas of poverty, education, health and welfare.

Credibility is an issue because it is difficult to place faith in some of the statements issued by the Executive Branch of government. Whether we are talking about the cost of the war in Vietnam, assessments of how we are doing over there, whether we are talking about the nation's budget and the true size of the deficit, or half a hundred other critical problems, Americans find it difficult any longer to believe what they are told.

Our people have always demonstrated a willingness to pull together in times of crisis and to make whatever sacrifices are called for to see us through the crisis. But to do that, they must know the facts. If Americans cannot have faith in the accuracy of their Government's statements, the whole structure and operation of our system is undermined. This affects every problem we face both at home and abroad. Without credibility in our nation's leadership, no meaningful or lasting action can be effectively undertaken.

My friends in the canning industry, the future course of Federalism is perhaps the overriding concern of Americans. All problems in America must be treated within the framework of our governmental institutions. The debate focuses on whether Washington should do it all or whether the various levels of our society should pull together in a true partnership. The tendency in recent years has been to make Washington the chief problem-solver by piling program upon program, directed, regulated and administered from Washington, D.C.

A better way, which would insure the preservation and strengthening of true federalism would be to enact a broad system of revenue-sharing including tax credits both for state and local taxes paid and for such special purposes as education and job training. We should also consolidate the hundreds of existing programs into bloc grants to provide more flexibility and effectiveness in getting the job done. This would be a far better way for Americans to do things.

If federalism is going to survive, it's up to the Congress to look over the 458 grant-in-aid programs that are currently on our statute books each with its own bureau chief, each with its own army, battalion or company of federal employees administering these grant-in-aid programs on the basis of priorities which are established in our central government in this federal system of ours. They hand out \$17 billion this year to state and local communities, to school boards, to county governments all over America on the basis of projects that are submitted by the school boards, the county governments and state governments to a bureau in Washington, D.C.

I believe that if the Congress looks into these programs they will find that there are better ways to do things for America and there is a better insurance policy for America than the categorical grant-in-aid approach currently being used in Washington, D.C. That insurance policy is important if this federal system of ours is going to survive and it goes back to one basic psychological difference that exists in America today and that is: do we have problem solvers on our local school boards, on our city councils and are the governors capable and the legislators capable in each of our 50 states to solve problems?

As I have gone around and looked at the mayors and governors and the various individuals from one end of this country to the other I find that we have problem solvers in state legislatures, in county governments and city governments on our school boards and we have capable people as school administrators; but the reason that many of the problems in health, education and welfare in this federal system of ours are not being solved in the years 1967 and 1968 have not been because of the lack of individual creativity in these offices—it has been because of the lack of resources at the local level that have been restricted by the central government in this federal system of ours.

What we must do during this period of time, if federalism is going to survive, is look at a better way. I believe that this better way is resource or revenue-sharing with our states and local communities. I urge the national canning industry to look at revenue-sharing as a better way for Americans to do things as we face the decades of the 70's. This includes giving tax credits on federal income taxes for state and local taxes paid, whether they be real estate taxes or income taxes, whether they be sales taxes or excise taxes—tax credits against the federal income tax payments for local and state taxes paid, so that when a local unit of government or school board has to go in to solve a particular problem, they don't always run into some project that has to be approved or disapproved on the basis of priorities established in Washington.

You know, I have over 658 projects pending in my congressional district in the educational field alone. You can see how that's multiplied in each of 458 programs with the decisions being made in Washington, D.C. I think that you will join with me and the others in saying that there is truly a better way to protect our federal system than transferring all the decision making to Washington, D.C. and that better way is to keep the decision making where it should be with the problem solvers at the state and local level.

This is my challenge to you. I believe the federal system can survive, but we in this year 1968 have to be willing to make the tough, hard decisions that are necessary to bring it about.

LSD Legislation

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the great chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, HARLEY O. STAGGERS, and the chairman of the committee's Subcommittee on Public Health and Welfare, JOHN JARMAN, for their work on legislation providing penalties for possession and use of LSD.

The subcommittee has already had 1 day of hearings and on Monday will hear from Members of Congress.

As the author of one of these bills I intend to testify. I know the terrible effects of these drugs, having served as chairman some years ago, of a special committee to investigate narcotics.

One of the major health and social problems with which this country is confronted is the growing misuse of drugs. Use of amphetamines, barbiturates, and LSD by our youth for the sole purpose of thrill seeking has spawned crime and

violence in our streets and significantly contributes to the unfortunate and rapid rise in juvenile delinquency. The extent to which our population is resorting to false psychological states of euphoria is indeed alarming. We are faced today with the challenge of directing our youth to more meaningful endeavors and stemming the advocacy of drug indulgence.

Perhaps the most effective weapon against the indiscriminate use of stimulant, depressant, and hallucinogenic drugs is education; and I will wholeheartedly support increases in the educational efforts of the various Federal and State enforcement agencies involved in drug surveillance. However, we must buttress education and information with a comprehensive regulatory scheme.

The lucrative profits available in the mushrooming market for stimulant, depressant, and hallucinogenic agents has seen the entry of the hardened criminals and syndicates in the illicit drug traffic. Illegal traffickers have managed to divert massive quantities of dangerous drugs. The Food and Drug Administration has on several occasions made single seizures of these products involving over half a million tablets. Operators in this racket have even begun to peddle their products along established routes covering many States. Our prime objective in the enforcement of drug laws should be directed to the suppliers of this type of human bondage. The sale of LSD and other dangerous drugs must be halted.

Hallucinogenic compounds such as LSD and STP best exemplify the manifold tragic consequences incidental to clandestine drug use. We are now almost accustomed to hearing reports of violent and bizarre crime associated with LSD "trips." Malformations at birth are now being linked with LSD and chromosome changes have been observed. The problem thus affects not only this generation but possibly future generations. Every day a new compound captivates the warped minds of this Nation's subcultures. "Speed," methamphetamine, is the newest product to reach the streets.

Yet today the illegal manufacture and sale of LSD, amphetamines, and barbiturates is only punishable as a misdemeanor; hardly enough to deter persons from seeking the lucrative profits available. President Johnson stated in his state of the Union message that "the time has come to stop the sale of slavery for the young." Accordingly, in his crime message the President recommended increased penalties and pointed out that the sale of marihuana is a felony, even though the detrimental effects of marihuana are no greater than those posed by the use of LSD. The discrepancy in penalties is not justified from the standpoint of their use or from the standpoint of the crimes, antisocial behavior or highway accidents which they cause. I, therefore, am the author of legislation to increase the penalties surrounding the manufacture, sale and use of LSD and other dangerous nonnarcotic drugs.

I am confident that more severe penalties in the drug abuse area will act as a significant deterrent for those that otherwise might profit from the sale of these drugs. Potential users will also be

more wary of indulging and hopefully will forego such a hazardous experience.

Washington Loved Home

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, as we commemorate the anniversary of the birthday of George Washington, I want to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in one of our Fairfax County newspapers. Certainly, I am pleased to represent the district in which our first President was born, reared, died, and is buried.

Washington is known to schoolchildren and to the world as being a truthful and honest man. In fact, legend has it that he admitted to his father that he chopped down the cherry tree with his little hatchet and could not lie when questioned about it.

Our country has progressed a long way since Washington's day, and we would not want to return in most aspects of our daily life. But would not it be a credit to our Nation if our Government in all of its activities could meet this simple truthfulness for which Washington is remembered, rather than to be known both at home and abroad as a Nation that may not always tell the truth?

No one of us can be proud of the credibility gap that appears to be the hallmark of the present administration.

The editorial of the Fairfax County Journal-Standard referring to Washington's home at Mount Vernon is set forth below and I commend it to you:

WASHINGTON LOVED HOME

George Washington—President, general and statesman—always thought of himself as a country squire. And he lavished his love for the soil on Mount Vernon.

"No estate in United America is more pleasantly situated than this," Washington wrote proudly. "It lies in a high, dry, and healthy Country . . . on one of the finest Rivers in the world."

Mount Vernon has been preserved as a patriotic shrine in Virginia by the Mount Vernon Ladies Association since 1853. Now the view across the Potomac will also be protected, the National Geographic Society says.

The Government has acquired 1,000 water-front acres in Maryland to be called Piscataway Park. The tract will block any commercial development that could mar the view from Mount Vernon. A public outcry narrowly averted construction of a sewage treatment plant on the scenic shoreline a few years ago.

Piscataway will preserve a panorama that has delighted visitors ever since Washington acquired the property in 1754. Said a guest in 1787: "The View down the River is extensive and most charming—nearly opposite the House the River Piscataway empties itself into the majestic Patowmack and adds greatly to the beauty of the Scene. In a Word this is altogether the most charming Seat I have seen in America."

Washington kept an eye on Mount Vernon even during the dark days at Valley Forge. In a letter he asked his steward: "To go on in the improvement of my estate in the manner theretofore described to you, fulfilling my plans and keeping my property together are

the principle objects I have in view during these troubles . . ."

Under Washington's solicitous care, Mount Vernon developed into one of the handsomest estates of the period. The modest nine-room house he inherited from his step-brother Lawrence more than doubled in size. Gardens and efficiently grouped outbuildings sprouted in a villagelike setting near the main building. Acreage tripled.

Mount Vernon's master took a personal hand in the daily chores. "He . . . often works with his Men himself, strips off his Coat and labours like a common man," observed an amazed guest.

Mount Vernon now attracts more than a million visitors a year. Washington's own words speak through the years to welcome them: "I have no objection to any sober or orderly person's gratifying their curiosity in viewing the buildings, Gardens, &c (etc.) . . ."

Passing ships of the United States Navy still pay their respects to Washington from the Potomac. Colors are half-masted, taps sounded; crewmen salute. The tribute probably began in 1801 when a newly commissioned frigate fired a 13-gun salute opposite the late Commander-in-Chief's home.

Such homage is appropriate, for Mount Vernon is more than a shrine. In a National Geographic article, Lonnelle Aikman wrote: "Mount Vernon is not just a national symbol, a historic monument to commemorate the remote deeds of a successful general and President. Its appeal is to the human heart as the home of George and Martha Washington."

General Washington, Let's Be Reasonable

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, in the February 15, 1968, issue of the Stars and Stripes—the National Tribune there is printed a scathing bit of whimsy written by Mr. Ferd Bronzell, who is Illinois State adjutant of the Military Order of the Purple Heart. It is well worth reading by every American for Mr. Bronzell compares the Spirit of '76 with the lack of spirit of '68. The article follows:

GENERAL WASHINGTON, LET'S BE REASONABLE
(By Ferd Bronzell)

If George Washington could come to life on the 236th anniversary of his birth and meet Jack Apologist, their conversation might go like this:

Washington: I see hundreds of American servicemen in Viet Nam earning the Badge of Military Merit—a decoration which I instituted on Aug. 7, 1782, but which you now call the Purple Heart Medal. They are truly on the road to glory. They agree with me that the United States is a free country; and being patriots, they cannot do otherwise than answer the call of their country. Like my fellow patriots during the Revolutionary War, the farmers and laborers and clerks are making sacrifices that will insure the continuation of freedom in this country. But, I ask, what has given rise to the draftcard burners and—what is the term—peaceniks? Has the concept of merit been lost to many of the people?

Jack Apologist: General, you must understand that they are exercising their privilege of dissent—something that you should understand. Let me tell you like it is. If we prevent them from violating federal and state laws, we would be depriving them of their birthright of dissent—an idea that you fought for valiantly. Sure, they may destroy

property, interfere with the free passage and rights of others, but that is part of the game. They are actively displaying that dissent which proves that the United States is still a viable democracy.

Washington: How do you explain the attitude of indifference among many of the ordinary citizens?

Jack Apologist: True, many are indifferent. Check at almost any bank and you will see people cashing United States Savings Bonds the day after receiving them. You have to understand, General, we are experiencing inflation. It takes a lot of money to buy new cars, television sets, and air conditioners. How could the people keep up with the news in Viet Nam if they could not sit in air-conditioned rooms, watching the progress in Viet Nam on their television sets. General, be reasonable.

Washington: What motivates those young Americans, a term I use advisedly, who make fraudulent and hypocritical appeals in order to gain deferment from the draft? Is this support for the troops in Viet Nam?

Jack Apologist: General, please. Don't you realize that the families of these men would suffer undue hardship if they were drafted. Don't you know that because of inflation, four and five salaries are needed to keep a family up to our normal standard of living.

Washington: I am confounded by all the grumbling over the taxes which are necessary to support the men in Viet Nam. How do you explain this?

Jack Apologist: This is an old American game, General. It's a custom, like Monday morning quarterbacking. Sure, we try to chisel a bit here and there on our income taxes, and complain about what we do pay; but we all do it. So it's OK.

Washington: Do you think it is fair for so many Americans to hurt, either deliberately or thru indifference, the morale of the troops in Viet Nam?

Jack Apologist: Remember, General, you had your Tories.

Washington: Yes, but we dealt with the Tories.

East Michigan Tourist Association Resolution on Travel

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of the Members of the House a resolution of the board of directors of the East Michigan Tourist Association expressing concern over the balance-of-payments problem and advocating a policy of unrestricted nontaxed travel.

Travel is a two-way street and only if it is allowed to continue on that basis will we Americans be able to effectively influence our world neighbors and bring about an era of mutual understanding and cooperation.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas citizens of the United States have always held to the tradition of freedom for Americans to travel throughout this nation and in foreign lands, and

Whereas travel by Americans, a major export-import industry of this nation, constitutes one of the most important international activities that works toward world peace and understanding, and

Whereas the Government of the United States has introduced measures including direct taxation that would bar Americans

their traditional freedom of travel throughout the world through the Executive and Legislative branches as the major effort to reduce our balance of international payments deficit.

Now therefore be it resolved that the East Michigan Tourist Association, by powers vested in its Board of Directors, does hereby express its deep concern of the problem of the foreign payments situation of this nation and announce its support of a positive program to combat the serious situation confronting the American dollar by supporting the concept of unrestricted non-taxed travel for all citizens of all countries to visit the United States Travel Service for tourist promotion in foreign countries. In supporting this positive approach the members of this association give full support to the policies and recommendations of the National Association of Travel Organizations for overcoming the payments problem.

Poll Finds Nixon Widens Lead With Backing of 51 Percent in GOP

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Times of February 21, 1968:

POLL FINDS NIXON WIDENS LEAD WITH BACKING OF 51 PERCENT IN GOP

PRINCETON, N.J., February 20.—Richard M. Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over seven other leading G.O.P. contenders as the top choice of Republican voters for the 1968 Presidential nomination.

The former Vice President is the favorite of half (51 per cent) of rank-and-file Republicans in the latest (early February) Gallup Poll survey and now leads his closest rival, Governor Rockefeller of New York, by the wide margin of 26 percentage points.

Mr. Rockefeller's standing has shown little change since the previous survey, in early January, while Mr. Nixon has gained 9 percentage points.

Governor Rockefeller's surge in popularity with Republican voters came between the November and January surveys, when he nearly doubled his share of the vote from 15 per cent to 27 per cent.

Mr. Nixon has led the field in all but one of the 23 tests of G.O.P. candidate strength conducted since the 1964 Presidential election. The exception came in November 1966, when the newly re-elected Gov. George Romney of Michigan briefly moved into the lead.

Governor Romney, the only other announced candidate on the list, continues to lose favor with Republicans. Firmly in second place before his "brainwash" statement in early September (with 24 per cent of the vote to Nixon's 35 per cent), Mr. Romney now has only 7 per cent of the vote and is in fourth place behind Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Interviewing for the current survey was completed Feb. 7, immediately following Mr. Nixon's announcement of his candidacy and just prior to the clash between Mayor Lindsay of New York and Governor Rockefeller over the recent sanitation strike in that city.

Other potential candidates listed in the survey were Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois, Senator Mark O. Hatfield of Oregon and retired Lieut. Gen. James H. Gavin.

Here is the question asked:

"Here is a list of men (card lists 8) who have been mentioned as possible Presidential candidates for the Republican party in 1968. Which ONE would you like to see nominated as the Republican candidate for President in 1968?"

Here are the latest choices of Republicans, compared with those from surveys in January and September:

	[In percent]			
	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon.....	51	42	40	35
Rockefeller.....	25	27	17	14
Reagan.....	8	8	16	11
Romney.....	7	12	14	24
Percy.....	3	5	9	6
Hatfield.....	2	2	1	2
Lindsay.....	2	1	1	2
Gavin.....	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference.....	1	2	2	6

1 Not included on earlier list.

The results in today's report are based on a national sample of Republicans and cannot be applied to any one region or state.

Mr. Nixon has also registered gains with independents, voters who do not align themselves with either major party. Governor Rockefeller in January had drawn even with Mr. Nixon, but the latter has now moved into a 34 to 26 per cent lead among these voters.

The choices of independents are important since numerically they represent a voting group as large as Republicans. In order to do well in a Presidential election, a Republican nominee must make a good showing with this group.

The choices of independents, and the comparison:

	[In percent]			
	February	January	Late September	Early September
Nixon.....	34	27	29	23
Rockefeller.....	26	27	20	16
Reagan.....	13	14	15	17
Romney.....	11	13	17	20
Percy.....	5	7	5	6
Lindsay.....	2	3	5	6
Hatfield.....	2	2	1	1
Gavin.....	1	1	(1)	(1)
No preference.....	6	6	8	11

1 Not included on earlier list.

District of Columbia Police Pay Raise, Education, and Recruitment Incentives

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, February 26, during the presentation of H.R. 15131 there will be presented an amendment which will add education and recruitment incentives to the District of Columbia police and fireman pay raise bill.

In order to make these available to all Members on Monday I am having this proposed amendment printed in full in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

I also include an article by Mr. James Stinchcomb entitled "Higher Pay for Higher Education" in the RECORD im-

mediately following the proposed amendment:

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 15131 PROPOSED TO BE OFFERED BY MR. ADAMS

(NOTE.—The following will be added as two new sections to the bill.)

Page 10, after line 21, insert the following new sections:

"SEC. 6. (a) Any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force—

"(1) who is serving in a salary class (other than salary class 9 or 10) of the salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, and

"(2) who is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (c) to have satisfactorily completed at least 30 but less than 60 semester hours or the equivalent of law enforcement or police administration courses at an accredited institution of higher education,

shall, if he has completed his one-year's probation, be paid \$600 per annum in addition to the basic rate of compensation prescribed for such officer or member in such salary schedule.

"(b) Any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police force, the United States Park Police force, or the White House Police force—

"(1) who is serving in a salary class (other than salary class 9 or 10) of the salary schedule contained in section 101 of the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, and

"(2) who is determined under regulations prescribed under subsection (c) to have satisfactorily completed at least 60 semester hours or the equivalent of law enforcement or police administration courses at an accredited institution of higher education, shall, if he has completed his one-year's probation, be paid \$1,200 per annum in addition to the basic rate of compensation prescribed for such officer or member in such salary schedule.

"(c) Such regulations as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of subsections (a) and (b) shall be issued by the District of Columbia Council in the case of the Metropolitan Police force, by the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the United States Park Police force, and by the Secretary of the Treasury in the case of the White House Police force. The Council and such Secretaries shall standardize such regulations to the fullest extent possible. The additional amount of compensation authorized by those subsections shall be included in any basic computation for retirement purposes under the Policemen and Firemen's Retirement and Disability Act (D.C. Code, title 4, chapter 5) and for the purpose of determining the amount of insurance for which an individual is eligible under chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code.

"SEC. 7. (a) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized, under regulations prescribed by the District of Columbia Council, to pay or reimburse an individual for the travel expenses which he incurred in traveling between his home or place of business and the District of Columbia for the purpose of ascertaining whether he is qualified for appointment to the position of private in the Metropolitan Police force. The regulations of the District of Columbia Council may (1) authorize the payment of a per diem allowance in lieu of subsistence, and (2) prescribe maximum amounts of allowable travel expenses which may not exceed the maximum amounts authorized for employees of the government of

the District of Columbia under subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

"(b) The Commissioner of the District of Columbia is authorized, under regulations prescribed by the District of Columbia Council, to pay to a person who is newly appointed as a private in the Metropolitan Police force and who is required to relocate his place of residence in order to come within the required area of residence for officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force (prescribed in the first section of the Act of July 25, 1956 (D.C. Code, 4-132a))—

"(1) a cash resettlement allowance not to exceed \$250, and

"(2) a per diem allowance not to exceed \$7.50 per day for a period not to exceed ninety days beginning with the date of his appointment.

The allowances authorized by this subsection shall not be allowed unless the person appointed shall agree in writing to remain a member of the Metropolitan Police force for twenty-four months following his appointment unless separated for a reason beyond his control and acceptable to the Commissioner. In case of violation of such agreement, any moneys expended by the District of Columbia on the allowances authorized by this subsection shall be recoverable from the individual concerned as a debt due the District of Columbia. The Commissioner may waive in whole or in part a right of recovery under this subsection, if it is shown that the recovery would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest."

(NOTE.—The above sections will take effect on the date of enactment. The necessary technical and conforming amendments required by the insertion of the two new sections are not shown.)

HIGHER PAY FOR HIGHER EDUCATION—A REVIEW OF EDUCATIONAL INCENTIVE PAY PROGRAMS FOR POLICE OFFICERS NOW IN EFFECT IN THE UNITED STATES

(By James D. Stinchcomb)

Only several years ago, there were increasingly frequent references being made to the desirability of college attendance for certain police specialties. Then more recently the discussion has shifted from whether or not education was a luxury that policing could afford to how best it could become an integral part of the system. The momentum has carried some 140 institutions of higher learning into this field of study with a formalized degree program and at this writing only 15 states are not able to identify a police degree program within their boundaries. Now another discussion is emerging relative to higher education; once again it is one that has been heard before in other career fields and once again it can be predicted that in a few more years it will no longer even be a matter requiring debate. The reference is to "incentive pay scales" or the policy of establishing higher salary levels for persons who successfully complete academic work in pursuit of a college degree.

In mid-March of this year, the United States Civil Service Commission issued a directive permitting certain college graduates to be paid higher starting salaries than usual for their particular entrance grade. In doing this the Civil Service Commission was responding to pressures from federal agencies which are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with industry for promising young persons. Specifically the difference amounts to some \$1,100 for those students who qualify for entrance above the general entry level for college graduates. For a graduate degree, this financial gain can amount to \$2,300 on the basis of only one year's graduate study. The concept, rather than the amount, should be important to police administrators. Those

who must face the recruitment task in the coming years, remembering the changing society and the general educational attainments nationally, would do well to sow such seeds immediately, modest though they may be.

To postpone any discussion of the concept that greater qualifications demand differential reimbursements could well hamper recruitment of quality personnel in the near future because young careerists are naturally going to be favorably predisposed to seek out those departments which have demonstrated their leadership in this emerging profession. The Chief who feels he needs precedent in terms of public funded agencies in his community that have a similar plan should obtain the local school board salary scale. That scale doubtless will reflect significant differences for those who enter teaching on an emergency certification basis without a bachelor's degree, for those who possess an undergraduate degree, for those who possess credits toward a master's, for those who have been awarded the master's and for those who have received considerable credits beyond the master's. There will also probably be a top salary bracket for those who possess the doctorate. Law enforcement agencies could immediately adopt an overall plan that calls for differential salary levels for those possessing 30 credits above the high school diploma. This would certainly be a modest beginning but each 30 credits could increase the income potential significantly and, of course, performance would have to continue to be satisfactory. Thus it is not merely an automatic raise. Hopefully such a program would assist the police department in retaining its better educated personnel and gradually enable that department to employ only officers with educational backgrounds.

Probably the best known efforts to achieve incentive pay for educational achievement have been accomplished by California's Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training. Several examples from that state will perhaps prove helpful to police administrators interested in obtaining details on some departments that have achieved this and what amounts of money are involved.

Ventura, California, offers 5 and 10 per cent salary additions for two and four years of college, respectively. In Arcadia, California, a 5 per cent pay step is available to officers who possess 60 college units or an associate degree. Likewise in Fairfax and Fairfield, California, a 5 per cent pay increase is available. Other communities, obviously interested in encouraging continuing college attendance, have offered pay programs amounting to \$1.00 per month for each semester credit completed successfully. Cities in this category include Lynwood and Maywood, California. Somewhere between on such scales lies Irwindale, California, which rewards each three credits completed with \$5.00 per month increase. Most of these departments do have maximum amounts that can be obtained. In Holtville, California, 30 credits is worth an additional \$25.00 per month and the associate degree earns an additional \$50.00 per month.

One of the obvious advantages of such efforts appears to be that with a differential pay plan, many department's entrance salary will rise above that figure which college students consider essential. This will be especially true of young men possessing associate degrees from local community colleges and also those more inclined toward municipal police careers rather than federal service.

If the pay plan does not achieve this goal, it is short-sighted and not as likely to affect recruitment. It will, for years to come, however, have an impact on police officers who complete their education while employed. Initially, either aspect of the plan is vital but both ultimately must be achieved. Last

this discussion appear to suggest that only California has achieved this significant step forward, we can identify similar progress in the vicinity of the nation's capital.

The Arlington County (Virginia) Police Department provides an incentive arrangement for its personnel possessing degrees. That department has a top salary level of \$8,361 annually for a private. A degree would raise that police private's salary to \$8,756 annually. While an annual differential of \$395 might not be sufficient to attract recent college graduates in search of career employment, it certainly offers a modest motivating influence for present personnel who desire to increase their understanding and insight into the complexities of the enforcement task. This salary differential is reflected regardless of the rank which may be obtained.

The Montgomery County (Rockville, Maryland) Police Department has offered a 5 per cent educational salary differential for the past two years. Each Montgomery County police officer who earns 15 or more credits receives this pay differential as long as he participates in the Police Professional Advancement Program. Upon completion of a college degree that 5 per cent differential becomes permanent. This incentive program, therefore, becomes both a reward for achievement as well as an incentive to complete a degree. Currently some 115 police officers from that department receive the educational salary differential.

The City of Tulsa (Oklahoma) earlier this year increased its award of \$20.00 per month for each two years of work in police science education. The plan now provides for a one-step pay raise for completing two years of police science, and another step increase for completing two more years and earning a degree. Thus, an officer may receive from \$25.00 to \$40.00 extra for each two years completed, and an officer with a degree will earn \$50.00 to \$80.00 extra per month. The increases, of course, are contingent upon satisfactory work performance, and length of service is reflected in the step increases. The Tulsa Police Department indicates that some 30 officers have already earned the two-year educational increase.

Effective January 1, 1967, the police department in the City of Wauwatosa (Wisconsin) adopted an educational incentive pay plan for police officers. More recently this plan was expanded to include all other city employees. Under this plan an officer in Wauwatosa, Wisconsin, receives an increment of $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1 per cent of his base pay for each three credit college courses completed on his own time while a member of the department. At present the maximum increment is 5 per cent.

One of the very important features of the above mentioned programs is that not only are law enforcement courses encouraged, but there is equal incentive for the pursuit of such courses as sociology, English, psychology, political science, and others which will broaden the officer's understanding of his complex responsibilities.

One of the more recent plans of this type has received approval in the Village of Park Forest (Illinois). Under this plan an additional salary step has been added for those officers with five years of service in the department and who complete a specified number of training units. These training units may be obtained through the University of Illinois Police Training Institute in addition to four required liberal arts courses. The additional salary step, according to a recent departmental directive, should amount to an increase of 8 to 10 per cent more.

For approximately one and one-half years now, the city of Saginaw (Michigan) has offered a two-step incentive pay plan for those officers who receive a degree in law enforcement. The first pay step of approximately

\$200 per year is available upon receipt of the associate degree. The second pay step of approximately \$400 per year is available to those officers who complete requirements for the bachelor's degree in law enforcement. Prior to the establishment of this program, as was the case in several of the others previously mentioned, members of the department were surveyed to determine their interest in college attendance. In the Saginaw experience, two-thirds of the department's personnel indicated interest in pursuing such a program, and it was determined that the costs involved would be more than offset by the dividends which would accrue to both the community and the individual officers.

On the East Coast we can find one of the most ambitious efforts in this direction.

The Fair Lawn (New Jersey) Police Department very recently worked out a plan whereby patrolmen will receive a salary increase from \$7,750 to \$10,000 upon completion of a police science degree. Officers in all ranks may obtain an additional \$17.00 for each college credit earned while in pursuit of a college degree. Certainly this plan is clearly in line with the recent recommendation from the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice. That report states that the median educational level for all policemen in the United States is 12.4 years and that this trend should be sharply accelerated. There is little doubt that this trend is advancing even more rapidly than once anticipated, and competitive salaries can be expected to assume their proper roles as educational qualifications advance.

Strong arguments in support of such pay plans can be offered to the local officials responsible for total community expenditures. Although there is no desire to discourage the limited mobility that we just now are beginning to experience, it should be noted that every effort also must be made to encourage the retention of police officers in the department that cooperates in personnel educational programs. A small department will have equal access to qualified personnel if its salary structure can compete realistically, and the larger departments likewise can provide higher salaries without concern for the narrowing pyramid which restricts the number of qualified officers who may be promoted in rank. Hopefully such an arrangement would reduce the obvious advantage that other career fields now offer to police officers who find themselves in a system that does not provide for additional pay steps beyond the initial 3-5 years experience and, furthermore, cannot offer impending vacancies at the next higher rank. And again as in the public school system, it is not our desire to reward only the leadership. Salaries must be competitive and attractive to the patrol officer who performs the daily tasks. In fact, the classroom teacher rarely seeks an administrative position because he finds the challenges of his field of knowledge and his clientele more rewarding personally. This should not discourage ambition but does suggest strongly that all levels of assignments and operations deserve incentive rewards and these should not come about solely because of promotions to staff positions in administration.

A number of communities have recently expressed interest in adopting plans such as these described. While we are aware of some that have even submitted requests, we have described only those known to be currently in operation. Comments from police administrators in departments possessing incentive pay plans were consistently favorable toward them insofar as employed personnel were concerned. The reservations expressed suggest that as a recruitment device they do not represent sufficient differential to attract applicants who already possess the bachelor's degree. Experience so far in recruiting those

with the Associate degree is limited and therefore still inconclusive. Presently many young men pursuing the associate degree enter military service rather than embark on careers; others enter the police departments as cadets and thereby become part-time students thus delaying their degrees. We can, however, note with encouragement the comments from these progressive communities regarding their intention to expand the pay differential to become more competitive with other career fields requiring higher education.

U.S. Ambassador to OAS Shuns Arm-Twisting Diplomacy—Wins Friends and Results for a Strengthened Hemisphere Organization

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when our forces are engaged in a fierce struggle in Vietnam, too little public attention is given to our efforts to secure and strengthen efforts toward progress and friendship in the Western Hemisphere.

Previously, the United States has been accused of conducting its Western Hemisphere diplomacy by using strong-arm, or "dominant nation" tactics. The results of these tactics, both with individual Latin American countries, and within the Organization of American States, have frequently been less than desirable.

I am happy to report that one of the most significant steps of progress in Pan-American relations in this decade has taken place this month. The Organization of American States has elected a strong and dynamic Secretary-General, Ecuador's Galo Plaza Lasso. Lasso, a former President of Ecuador, favors an OAS with an active and expanded role. He was elected with the support of the United States, but without the behind-the-scenes arm twisting that once characterized our Latin American diplomacy.

The man most responsible for this success, and for this change in the U.S. approach is U.S. Ambassador to the OAS Sol M. Linowitz. His unconventional brand of man-to-man, persuasive diplomacy has done much to enhance our partnership with, and to deemphasize our dominance over our neighbors in the Western Hemisphere.

I am proud to claim Sol Linowitz as both a good friend and a constituent. Before he entered public life, he contributed much to my home community of Rochester, N.Y., as chairman of the board of Xerox Corp. I know that my colleagues join me in praising the successful application of his many talents to the crucial area of Western Hemisphere relations.

With so many eyes turned to the battlefronts of Southeast Asia, it is good to know that we also have some very skillful eyes trained on our own hemi-

sphere. I am pleased to share with my colleagues two editorials which appeared in the Washington Post and the New York Times concerning the election of the new OAS Secretary-General, which take note of this important turn in United States-Latin American relations: [From the Washington Post, Feb. 14, 1968]

OPPORTUNITY AT THE OAS

The election of Galo Plaza Lasso of Ecuador as Secretary General of the Organization of American States is as important for the way it was done as for what it does. With enough effort of the right sort by all the members of inter-American system, it may well turn out to be the best thing that's happened to the OAS and to political life in this hemisphere since the principle of multilateralism was first introduced.

What it does is place at the head of the OAS a man of stature and energy who has been President of his own country, Ambassador to this country and an effective United Nations trouble-shooter in Cyprus, the Congo and Lebanon. It is not too much to say that he is very probably the best man for the job—and therefore, by past practice, the last man likely to get it. He got it the hard way, on the sixth ballot, after three months of political and diplomatic tugging and hauling in as honest a demonstration of the democratic processes at work as the hemispheric system has ever seen.

What was different about the way it was done this time was the way the United States played its hand. The traditional approach (still very much accepted by some State Department professionals) has been for the United States Government to pretend publicly to have no preferences, while twisting arms unmercifully behind the scenes on behalf of a captive candidate. This time, thanks largely to the refreshing influence of an able amateur, Ambassador to the OAS Sol Linowitz, who is anything but a traditionalist, the United States made no big secret of its admiration for Galo Plaza, but employed persuasion rather than the familiar power play. The Latin American members of the OAS were given time and opportunity to exercise their own influence, individually and collectively, on the result. That it was a sensible result is no mark against the other leading candidates, Eduardo Ritter-Aislan of Panama, and former Foreign Minister Falcon Briceño of Argentina. Rather it is a mark of increased maturity for the system as a whole.

A strong Secretary General means a stronger inter-American system, and a brighter opportunity for all of the members to grapple together, to greater effect, with the momentous political and economic problems of the hemisphere. Above all, a stronger OAS opens opportunities for the Latin Americans, if they have the wit and the will, to work in their own interests and in the interests of the hemisphere as a whole on a more equal footing with the United States.

[From the New York Times, Feb. 14, 1968]

THE OAS COMES OF AGE

The Organization of American States has worked itself out of a leadership crisis in a way that opens exciting possibilities for a more active, more significant future. In breaking a three-month stalemate over the election of a new Secretary-General, the O.A.S. Council opted simultaneously for several objectives.

It clearly reflected the long-held desire of a majority of the twenty-two active member governments for an expanded O.A.S. role in promoting hemispheric cooperation and solidarity. It did so by electing Ecuador's talented Galo Plaza Lasso, a man uniquely

qualified to administer those greater O.A.S. responsibilities and to make the most of them.

In the process, the Council also served notice on recalcitrant Governments—the United States included—to get on with ratification of the amendments adopted a year ago by the American foreign ministers. These spell out an important part of that enlarged O.A.S. activity and responsibility.

Mr. Plaza, the ablest President in Ecuador's history and a seasoned United Nations mediator, survived handicaps and humiliations to win the O.A.S. post. He had been tagged—unfairly—as the United States candidate, and he also had to contend with the hopes of small Central-American and Caribbean countries that they would elect one of their own.

None of this should handicap or inhibit Mr. Plaza when he takes office in May. At 62, he is a ruggedly independent but sensitive statesman who sought the job only when convinced that most member nations wanted a "strong, dynamic, creative" organization with an executive to match. He understands the United States well but a more unlikely errand boy for the Johnson Administration would be hard to conceive.

The Central-American group has been satisfied by the designation of Salvador's able Miguel Rafael Urquiza as Assistant Secretary-General. For giving up that number two post, the United States will be asked to name a new Assistant Secretary-General for Administration with a view to tightening up the whole O.A.S. operation and thus guarding against the financial irregularities that added to the Organization's crisis last November.

As things have turned out, Chairman Fulbright of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee was off base last week in accusing the United States of "inept diplomacy" in its support of Mr. Plaza. Instead, the quiet pressure-free diplomacy of Ambassador Sol M. Linowitz paid off in a way that seemed impossible two months ago.

The result was that the O.A.S. ambassadors themselves worked out the compromise solution that now seems to please most of them and that opens new vistas for the Organization. For once, as one observer put it, the United States played throughout the role of "partner of the enterprise rather than boss of the enterprise."

Economic Consultant Sheds Light on Unearned Interest Enjoyed by Commercial Banks

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, no topic is more on the public mind, domestically speaking, than the financial condition of our great Nation. One of the most mystifying questions for most of our citizens is the process by which our money supply is increased and diminished.

Another little-known fact is that the money creation powers of the Federal Reserve System are utilized by the commercial banks to acquire interest-bearing Government bonds at no cost to the banks.

Every sovereign nation should have the power to borrow money when needed,

but I have long advocated such borrowing needs should be satisfied by tapping the real savings of our citizens. Fifteen billion dollars a year is simply an outrageous sum for the American people to pay in interest on bonds purchased with bank-created money.

No Government official or monetary economist will deny that the great bulk of this Nation's outstanding public debt was acquired by private holders on the basis of free bank reserves created by the Federal Reserve System. In this manner the Government issues an interest-bearing obligation—the bonds—in return for a non-interest-bearing obligation—Federal Reserve notes—created as a result of the Federal Reserve System-commercial bank alliance.

Mr. Speaker, time and space do not permit complete and detailed explanation of this outrageous situation, nor of the precise mechanism of the fractional reserve against demand deposits which permits the commercial banks to literally create money—checking accounts—out of thin air. However, I insert at this point in the RECORD a short, but very carefully reasoned statement by Mr. J. H. Leopold, of Atlanta, Ga., on why our money supply must increase if we are to enjoy economic progress:

THE REAL ECONOMICS

(By Joseph H. Leopold)

Free enterprise in the United States is being undermined as much by misunderstandings of its proponents, as by its opponents. A case in point is a recent published statement on inflation by the American Economic Foundation, an organization devoted to preserving free enterprise and the dissemination of "economic truths".

The AEF states that the story of our inflation starts in 1933 when the government began "deficit spending" by creating "new unearned money through the banking system, adding it to the money already in circulation, and thus raising prices". The statement continues:

"The people can also contribute to inflation . . . the commercial banks could easily create some new money for you or me (i.e., grant us a loan) . . . The bank would then give us what is called a deposit against which we can write checks. When the bank does this, the money supply of the nation is increased by the amount of our deposit . . .

"(However,) this new extra inflationary money created for us . . . disappears from the nation's money supply as soon as we pay our debt to the bank. But the extra money created for the government stays and stays and stays . . .

"The reason this extra money increases prices is that it does not represent the production of any extra goods or services for which the money can be exchanged; the people simply use more dollars to produce and exchange the same quantity of things".

Although hundreds of textbooks have been published in support of the foregoing, the writer will attempt to refute it in the few paragraphs available in this space.

While it is true that the "deficits" of the thirties, in terms of current GNP, were generally larger than post World War II "deficits" thus far, it is also true that inflation was not experienced during the thirties. In fact, the value of a 1940 dollar was about 20 cents more than a 1930 dollar. (Consumer prices in 1930 were about 20 percent higher than in 1940.)

With reference to the AEF belief that bank

issued dollars raise prices because the people use more dollars to produce and exchange the same quantity of things, this is refuted by examining what actually happens with borrowed dollars; for example, when a loan is taken out for a plant expansion. The new deposit dollars attract available human effort and technological knowhow to construct the new plant. Without the loan, the new plant would not be built.

Instead of being inflationary, the new dollars, by making possible the construction of more efficient new plants, also make possible the production of more customer goods at lower prices—the opposite of inflation.

In a pecuniary society, expenditure of new money is the only way that the economic machine can be driven to produce more wealth, because citizens will exert more productive effort only in exchange for more dollars for that additional effort.

A dollar is simply a claim against a dollar's worth of wealth for sale at current prices; or what amounts to the same thing, a claim against a dollar's worth of human effort capable of producing a dollar's worth of wealth for sale at current prices.

A seller fixes his dollar price by adding his desired profit to all his dollar costs. He is not at all interested in whether his customers borrowed or earned the dollars used for the purchase; nor does he raise his price when he receives an order from the government, especially if he must compete for the order.

Prices are determined entirely by relative scarcity of goods and services—nothing else. Relative scarcity of goods and services is determined by relative scarcity of skills available to produce the goods and render the services.

If the supply of credit money in an economy is scarce with respect to the availability of skills at current wage and profit rates, the skills go unused and we have unemployment. (The collapse of the housing industry last year is an illustration of this phenomenon.)

If there is an abundance of credit dollars in the economy with respect to availability of skills, lenders will compete with each other for borrowers, and interest rates will fall; the bottleneck to economic growth will then not be unavailability of credit. Throughout the decade of the Great Depression the banking industry maintained billions of dollars of "excess reserves" reflecting many more billions of dollars worth of unused lending authority. As a consequence, interest rates were very low; but there was no inflation.

It is a false belief to think that prices of goods are directly related to the scarcity of credit dollars. As noted, prices of goods are related to scarcity of goods. However, when credit dollars are scarce and interest rates are high, prices of goods financed with borrowed capital must be raised to include the higher interest charges; therefore, "tight money" is an engine of inflation.

With reference to the credit money supply process performed by the commercial banking industry, the AEF apparently is not aware of the vital contribution to real economic growth that this operation makes. Since 1929, the banks have created and issued to the public through loans of all kinds over 350 billion new deposit dollars not in existence in 1929. It is meaningless to say, as AEF does, that bank created money "disappears" when the loan is repaid because, as noted, outstanding loans are always increasing.

Last year alone (1967) over 40 billion new deposit dollars not in existence January 1 were created and issued to the economy. Without this credit money supply process the economy would promptly collapse in a "money panic," such as almost occurred late in 1966 when the Federal Reserve restricted

the lending authority of the commercial banking industry by refusing to issue sufficient "bank reserves" through the "open market."

In summary, the widespread belief that newly created dollars—for civilian or government use—are, per se, inflationary, is false. Expenditures are inflationary only if there is a shortage of goods desired to be purchased and a shortage of capability of producing these goods at current prices in response to demand. Since the U.S. economy is presently operating at only about four-fifths of its capacity to produce at current prices, it follows that about 25 percent more dollars are needed to be spent just to generate utilization of present idle plant capacity. Reduction in federal taxes is the only practicable source of these needed dollars. This fact will have to be recognized before any of our economic problems can be solved.

Statement of Representative Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia, in Support of His Bill Which Would Establish a University of the United States in Washington, D.C., Thursday, February 22, 1968

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to create a national institution—the University of the United States.

The University of the United States will take its place in Washington, D.C., to look toward the future of this country and fulfill a growing need which is being more clearly defined with every passing day. The problems of the United States of the future are being created today at a pace certainly undreamed of by General Washington and the other Founding Fathers, and even at a faster rate than could have been anticipated even as recently as World War II.

As we look ahead to a third century of the United States as a nation, we see rapidly advancing technology which will give us astounding advances in space, in medicine, biology and biochemistry. All of these great technical advances are bound up with social impact that affects an exploding population and, consequently, the orderly growth of a free society. What we cannot afford is to be confronted with scientific facts and methods which have a tremendous impact on all existing laws and mores without having been prepared. Certainly no responsible person wants to stand in the way of technological progress, which promises so much to our future and our children's future.

Our Government has many programs to encourage the scientific advances. What it does not have in abundance is organized thinking about how to provide the early warning of the problems the country will have to face and the identi-

fication of alternative solutions. We need to set up an institution in the broad public interest which looks ahead to identify, anticipate and isolate the major and even the minor problems that accompany the tide of the future. Of course, there is notable work being done in this area by private groups, but it is isolated and is too often tucked away as secondary to the limitless number of current problems we all face.

I think it is time for the country to formalize its approach to these social decisions of the future and commission some of its best minds to consider them not on an ad hoc basis, but over an extended period of time; as a primary activity.

It is with this as a partial background that I propose to you on George Washington's Birthday that we establish a national institute of advanced studies in Washington, D.C., with the unprecedented title of "The University of the United States." This would not be a university in the ordinary sense and should not be thought to detract in any way from the work of existing colleges and universities of Washington, D.C., and the rest of the country. Rather it will be a distinguished colleague to all of them.

I propose to you that this institution honor the memory of George Washington and be considered Congress' answer to a historical oversight dating back 169 years which kept Washington's wish for a national university in Washington, D.C., from being carried out.

General Washington bequeathed the Nation stock shares in the amount of approximately \$25,000. The stock was never received by Congress. As a loyal alumnus of George Washington University, I must mention my awareness that this institution, which changed its name from Columbian College in 1823 when Congress deeded it land in the District of Columbia, is in the tradition of the George Washington will bequest.

My proposal, however, calls for the direct establishment of a national university which shall be limited to advanced studies.

The University of the United States would tap its rotating faculty to serve for a 2- or 3-year period as "Fellows of the University of the United States," from the universities, the professions, business and industry and other appropriate areas of American life. These men and women, brought to Washington at the height of their careers for a period of public service, would be selected on the basis of their particular capacity in special fields of endeavor to study specific areas in the public interest. The published results of their work would be reported to Congress for establishment of priorities and guidelines in complex legislative problems which can arise as the result of change.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that the country needs and is ready for the University of the United States and I invite the interest and support of all my colleagues for the bill I introduce to you today.

How Dow Chemical Co. Saves Lives

HON. ELFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, the city of Midland, in my district, is the home of the Dow Chemical Co., one of the leading chemical companies in the world. Recently, this fine firm has been the subject of savage attacks, largely located on college campuses, simply because it is presently the sole manufacturer of napalm for our Armed Forces. The mob agitation and vilification directed to this company is totally unwarranted. The young radicals and draft resisters who are spearheading these attacks completely ignore this company's tremendous involvement in research and manufacturing for the health and welfare of humanity. Its manufacturing of napalm, which amounts to less than one-fourth of 1 percent of its sales, does not alter the fact that our Government is committed in a serious conflict in Vietnam and that this product is only one of many items of war being supplied by American industry in support of our fighting men. I take pleasure in presenting for the RECORD the following article from the February issue of *Nation's Business* which is particularly pertinent to this situation:

How Dow Saves Lives

When an emergency arose involving the Dow Chemical Co., state police and the National Guard early one morning last year, there wasn't a peacenik or a picket in sight.

A 3:00 a.m. call to the traffic manager of Dow's Pitman-Moore division in Indianapolis dispatched a vitally needed drug to a hospital on Virginia's Eastern Shore via Indiana Air Guard and Virginia state police.

This incident, in which Dow's drug was credited with helping save the life of a critically ill patient, is far more typical of the company's function than the national headlines it has been getting lately.

Militant pacifists, draft resisters and New Left radicals have subjected Dow to mob harassment to disrupt its college recruiting and to smear the company as a war profiteer or for complicity in an allegedly immoral government policy—resisting aggression in Viet Nam.

Their reason, of course, is that Dow is the sole producer of napalm used by U.S. forces in Viet Nam. They ignore the fact that this weapon has saved the lives of thousands of American fighting men.

Dow President Herbert D. Doan explains: "We intend to continue making napalm because we feel that so long as the United States is sending men to war, it is unthinkable that we should not supply the materials they need."

ONE CONTRIBUTION—SAVING LIVES

Critics also totally ignore Dow's other contributions to this country's health, safety, education and to the public weal—by the exercise of corporate citizenship and production of things that are just plain useful.

Napalm represents a minuscule proportion of Dow's sales—about one half of one percent of \$1.3 billion in 1966. Little has been said about the company's contributions to mankind. One of them, as is true of many corporate giants, is saving lives.

Take health research: The company has been working since 1957 on development of an artificial kidney. It has been under contract with the National Institutes of Health since June, 1966, to accelerate the program.

The unit, using hollow fibers for the filtration function, has passed successfully its first clinical test on a single human being and by next June will be in full testing with 30 patients.

A Dow spokesman notes that many patients depend on artificial kidneys of various types, all of which are "horrendously expensive," and that people have died because they couldn't afford the cost. "This is intolerable."

Purpose of the Dow program is to reduce the cost drastically.

Growing out of the company's own experience is a virus-cancer research contract with the National Institutes of Health to develop rigid procedures to protect medical researchers handling viruses believed to cause leukemia.

The project, drawing on Dow's experience in safeguarding its own employees handling dangerous substances, includes a state-of-the-art survey and development of a prototype control unit and a system of monitoring personnel during and after involvement in virus research.

Also in progress is research on diagnostic testing and related equipment, including blood chemistry processes now in development, premarket or early marketing stages, in efforts to make diagnoses faster, simpler and more accurate. Much of the work is done by Dow researchers at Zionsville, Ind., or at Bio-Science Laboratories, Van Nuys, Calif., mostly owned by the company.

Other research involves immunization against mumps and German measles, which can cause mental retardation among unborn children whose mothers are stricken during pregnancy. "We feel we're quite close to something useful in both of these areas," says a company official.

Already developed is a measles vaccine, which company people say is the only single-shot vaccine on the market. Dow estimates that since 1965, nine million persons have received the vaccine in the United States.

Measles, besides causing death, create complications resulting in extensive hospitalization, mental retardation and sleeping sickness.

Also in the human health field, Dow makes drugs for high blood pressure (including the one rushed to Virginia that early morning last year) and others still being researched. It makes gamma globulin (to prevent or reduce the severity of measles and infectious hepatitis), prenatal diet supplements, a widely used anesthetic and others undergoing tests, flu vaccine, decongestants, a gastrointestinal preparation, painkillers, blood serum and a wide range of ingredients used in the manufacture of other pharmaceutical products.

The company also is big in agricultural chemicals, including a low toxicity killer of mosquitoes—bearers of encephalitis. It minimizes the problem of residue encountered with DDT that was publicized in the late Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring." This product, now awaiting government registration for domestic use, has been used against cattle ticks abroad, one of the major problems limiting beef production in economically underdeveloped countries.

Dow produces rabies immunizations for dogs, as well as an extensive line of other animal immunizers, including one that attacks a disease otherwise prevalent in poultry.

And the company makes a line of weed and brush killers, soil fumigants and grain fumigants.

CXIV—248—Part 3

MANY PUBLIC SERVICES

Dow has long been cited by independent authorities in another area of public service—clean water. It makes chemicals for treatment of water supplies and waste water.

The company currently is involved in research aimed at treating storm water runoff, a growing problem in urban areas, and removal of phosphates from streams. These phosphates foster growth of plant life that consumes the natural oxygen content of water by which streams purify themselves.

Then, too, it has developed instrumentation to help engineers monitor pollution levels in streams.

It has taken elaborate precautions to reduce contamination of the air by its own manufacturing processes. One research program now under way—which the company won't discuss in detail—involves treatment of pollutants from automobile exhausts.

In a technological society, the end use of products manufactured by a basic company like Dow are seemingly endless.

As one company spokesman puts it, "We are a supplier to all industries."

Uses include everything from aircraft deicing fluids to deodorants.

Dow solvents are a major item, including special products for "white room" or dirt-free environments, essential in activities like missile production. Dow has also developed a monitoring process to enable users of solvents to assure that they don't contribute to air pollution.

In fact, the company maintains extensive laboratory facilities to assure that no harm comes from the manufacturing, processing, transportation or end use of its products.

Some products have direct safety implications, such as a brake fluid whose high boiling point guards against one cause of brake failure, a spray-can tire coating to provide traction for cars stuck in snow and a commercial chemical to remove ice from roads.

In the field of corporate contributions, Dow has furnished some \$60,000 to the famous hospital ship S.S. Hope in cash and donated products.

And in education, the company contributes well over a million dollars a year in cash to a large number of schools, even those where peacekeepers disrupt company recruiting.

In addition, the company has developed a college summer employment program for students in its research, product development, customer service, finance and marketing areas tailored to student and corporate needs.

The company's public affairs activity ranges from executives' service on the school board and city council in Midland, Mich., the corporate headquarters, to Board Chairman Carl A. Gerstacker's chairmanship of the Commerce Department's National Export Expansion Council.

Thus, like other giant chemical companies—Dow is the nation's fourth largest—the company is deeply involved in innumerable pursuits in the public interest; some will say to a unique degree.

This, of course, cuts no ice with hard-core radicals whose hostility to business is becoming clearer. (See "Why Young Radicals Zero in on Business," July, 1967.)

The company feels that the demonstrations may damage it over the years ahead but has reviewed and reaffirmed its decision to continue supplying the government with napalm.

Which leads one long-time Washington hand and former government official with broad knowledge of the chemical industry to observe that here, too, by not caving in under pressure, Dow is performing another distinct public service.

Let Us Today Also Honor Two 1968 National Heroes

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that I rise on this day which was set aside to honor a national hero, George Washington, to bring to the attention of this distinguished body two 1968 heroes—Lance Cpl. Jimmie Prideaux, of Brighton, Colo., and Pfc. Johnnie L. Evans, of Germantown, Ohio.

I knew Jimmie Prideaux personally. In 1964 I had the privilege of nominating him to the Military Academy, but he had to decline the nomination because of a badly broken leg. Subsequently he joined the Marine Corps.

I do not know Johnnie Evans, but I hope to someday.

Their story is one which should instill in all of us a sense of pride in the caliber of young men who are fighting and dying in Southeast Asia today—regardless of how we may feel individually about the Nation's involvement.

It should also shore up our faith in the Nation's ability to survive the grave crisis which faces us during these "long, hot summers."

With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD two outstanding newspaper accounts of the story of Jimmie Prideaux and Johnnie Evans.

[From the Rocky Mountain News, Feb. 14, 1968]

JOHNNIE'S TRIBUTE TO A FALLEN FRIEND

One of the most prized possessions a bereaved Brighton family has of their dead Marine son is a crumpled, stained letter of sympathy and grief from their son's comrade in arms in Vietnam.

Mr. and Mrs. Earl Prideaux, Jr. Monday received word from the War Department that their son, Marine Lance Corp. James E. Prideaux, 23, had been killed in action.

The message was terse, stating only that their son was killed Feb. 5 by a fragmentation device while in combat at Phau Tiem in a northern Vietnamese province near the DMZ.

The family was advised their son's body will be shipped home for burial in a week or 10 days at Ft. Logan National Cemetery.

THICK OF COMBAT

The father, a retired lieutenant colonel who commanded a combat engineer battalion in World War II with the Third Army, knew his son had been in the thick of combat. On a previous patrol, the young Marine and his buddies were pinned down five days in the jungle before being evacuated by helicopters.

Born June 30, 1944, in Scottsbluff, Corp. Prideaux attended Haxtun, Colo., High School, where he played football and basketball. He also was an outdoorsman and skier. In 1964, he was nominated by U.S. Rep. Don Brozman (R-Colo.) to West Point. But the young athlete had previously broken his leg in football and had been in a cast five months so was unable to enroll.

PRE-MED SCHOOL

Young Prideaux attended pre-med school at the University of Colorado for one year,

and the Colorado School of Mines 18 months prior to enlisting in the Marines in June, 1966.

He went to Vietnam last July, and had but 24 more days to serve there before attending jump school in Okinawa on the first of March.

Surviving besides his parents are a sister, Mrs. Mario Meakins, a Brighton school teacher; a younger brother, Robert a junior in Brighton High School, and his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Ole Thornby, of Belle Fourche, S. Dak.

Outside of the brief War Department notice, the family had skimpy knowledge as to the young Marine's death—until they received the letter from the Marine comrade.

POIGNANT LETTER

The letter was headed simply "First Platoon, Air Force Recon, First Marine Division." Starting with the salutation, "Dear Family," the letter said in simple, but poignant terms:

"I am very sorry about your great loss the family has to suffer. This is a letter to show how the company liked him. He was a brave man. When he got killed, him and a few more Marines were trying to recover a dead Marine's body on a bridge.

"I would have been there, but I got wounded. I was in the hospital when I heard the news. So don't think he died for nothing. I am tired of war, but I must keep fighting.

"Even though I am a Negro, I liked him because the color of people's skins don't matter to me. He was a good man. I mean it, too. With grief."

The letter was signed, "Johnnie."

[From the Longmont Daily Times-Call, Feb. 17, 1968]

WE THANK GOD FOR JOHNNIE EVANS (By Ed Lehman)

As we all live with concern about the threatened long, hot summer with its overtones of racial violence, a deeply human touch of understanding has been added this week to a tragedy in Colorado.

Mr. and Mrs. Earl Prideaux of Brighton were very proud of their son, Marine Lance Corp. James E. Prideaux who was killed Feb. 5 near the Demilitarized Zone in Vietnam. The usual combat casualty notices arrived, but they were followed soon afterward by a most touching letter.

Mr. and Mrs. Raleigh Messerschmitt of Longmont, longtime friends of the Prideaux family, brought me a copy of this letter from another Marine.

The author was Marine Pfc. Johnnie L. Evans, a Negro. He also had been wounded in the combat and reported he would have been with the Prideaux' son had he not been hospitalized.

"He was a brave man," wrote Johnnie Evans. He then went on to relate that the Marine had been killed trying to recover the body of a dead Marine from a bridge. He pointed out how much the other members of the Marine Company had liked Corporal Prideaux. But then he added:

"Even though I am a Negro, I liked him because the color of people's skins don't matter to me. He was a good man and I mean it too."

That message from the battlefield of Vietnam should be told to many because the brotherhood of man should not have to be found only in the holocaust of war.

Americans side by side today must stand together regardless of color or creed. We must not be fighting each other in pointless destruction to prove very little. Such instances of violence only set back the very causes for which all thinking people strive—regardless of their racial origins.

The message of Pfc. Johnnie Evans signed

"in grief" certainly should be far stronger than the fiery words of hate mongers who would destroy our cities and set American against American.

As a mighty nation, we must realize that the total strength only is the sum of the people who form its ranks. Is it not possible that these veterans of shoulder to shoulder comradeship and loyalty upon the field of battle can speak up as most effective leaders in these trouble spots?

Certainly we do not have to look for our leadership to those who seek only trouble. Basically, these people care very little for the fate of this nation. And they care even less for the free world in these trying times.

My faith goes out to Johnnie Evans. To him and many others, regardless of the color of their skin, rests a solemn responsibility to make American freedom a reality for each and all. Only then can we fulfill our responsibility and be certain that Marine Corp. James Prideaux did not sacrifice his life in vain.

Blunting the Wallace Threat

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, there is increasing awareness that this year's George Wallace presidential candidacy could very well precipitate a constitutional crisis if neither major political party candidate receives the necessary 270 electoral college votes.

Two of the major metropolitan newspapers in Minnesota, the St. Paul Pioneer Press and the Minneapolis Star, yesterday published editorials supporting my efforts this week to generate prompt congressional action on one of the various constitutional amendments already proposed which would insure orderly continuity of governmental leadership without fear of the Wallace threat of political blackmail.

As I have said each day this week, Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but not too late, to amend the Constitution so as to insure that minority candidate George Wallace cannot dictate the policies of the next President and Vice President of the United States.

The articles follow:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press, Feb. 21, 1968]

ANSWER TO WALLACE THREAT

Congressman Clark MacGregor is leading a valiant effort to move Congress toward prompt approval of a Constitutional Amendment abolishing the electoral college method of choosing the President. He hopes there still is a possibility of effecting such a change before next November's election.

While this would be extremely difficult to accomplish at this late date, the danger of the 1968 election being thrown into the House of Representatives is so real that a crash program to switch to direct popular voting on the Presidency is fully justified. If MacGregor manages to arouse the Congressional interest the situation calls for, he will be doing an important national service.

If House and Senate members would genu-

inely arouse themselves, MacGregor believes an amendment might be approved and submitted to the state legislatures by the middle of April. Then it would be up to the governors to call their legislatures into special session. Ratification by 38 states would make the amendment effective.

Despite the practical difficulties of completing this procedure with the necessary speed, the effort would be worthwhile. Even if it is found that the amendment process moves too slowly to effect November's election, it would be wise for Congress to move ahead with its portion of procedures as rapidly as possible. At least this would lay the foundation for effecting the reform before the 1972 Presidential campaign.

The 3rd party candidacy of George Wallace should be sufficient incentive to Congress to get moving. It poses a clear and present danger of denying both the Republican and Democratic Presidential nominees a majority of the electoral college vote. That would throw the election into the House where each state delegation would have a single vote. In a tight division Wallace could hold the balance of power. He declares it is his intention to seek just such a situation, and then to bargain (blackmail is a better word) with the two major parties. The one willing to accept his dictates on policy would get the White House prize.

If neither Republican or Democratic nominees would sell out to Wallace, there would be a stalemate in the House, and no President could be chosen until it was broken. The situation would be one of political chaos and national danger.

There is no justification for Congress holding back on approving and submitting an amendment at once. Not to take affirmative action will be an abdication of duty.

[From the Minneapolis Star, Feb. 21, 1968]

ELECTORAL COLLEGE REFORM

Many of the utterings of presidential candidate George Wallace can be dismissed as bombast, the kind of racist nonsense that will appeal only to tag-end segregationists. But the threat that Wallace poses to the orderly election of a President this year cannot be dismissed so lightly.

It is entirely possible that the Alabamian could win enough electoral votes to deprive the Democratic or Republican candidate of a majority. This would put the election into the House of Representatives, where each state would have one vote to cast. Wallace would then be in a position to wheel and deal—or, as he put it, to enter into "covenants"—to get what he really wants: a pledge from the winner that there will be no federal "interference" in Alabama's voter registration system, in its schools, and in its welfare programs. This would be the ugliest form of blackmail, but it would be legal, nonetheless.

The fault is not Wallace's. It is in the Electoral College system, which can permit a demagogue with a few votes in his pockets to negate the democratic process. Periodic attempts are made to abolish the Electoral College, but each has bumped against the hard fact that such a change requires a constitutional amendment that must be ratified by at least 38 states. Rep. Clark MacGregor, R-Minn., is now making such an attempt on the basis of the threat posed by Wallace's candidacy.

MacGregor's call for reform deserves support, but we feel he has set an impossible goal in trying to get a constitutional amendment ratified before the November election. It is hoped he will not abandon the task if his first effort fails. The attempt is worth making, even if the goal must be put off until the 1972 election.

**Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen Receives
Congressional Medal of Honor**

HON. WILEY MAYNE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MAYNE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month I was privileged to attend an impressive ceremony at the White House, upon which occasion the President of the United States conferred the Congressional Medal of Honor on a brilliant young flyer who was born and raised in my northwest Iowa district, and whose family still lives there.

I refer to Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen, of Clay County, Iowa, an F-105 pilot who last year completed 100 missions over North Vietnam. The mission score alone is spectacular, but the episode that brought him the Nation's highest honor occurred during one of those raids near Hanoi last March.

A man whose gift for words has earned him columnar space all over the country probably has described the action more dramatically than any communique or press release. So, Mr. Speaker, I incorporate in my remarks at this point an article by the famed commentator, Bob Considine, devoted to the award of the Medal of Honor to Major Dethlefsen, of whom Iowa and the Nation is understandably proud.

Mr. Considine's column, entitled "One Rough Day Last March," follows:

ONE ROUGH DAY LAST MARCH

(By Bob Considine)

The President said, "This is an afternoon when it is good to stand beside a man in uniform."

He was presenting the Congressional Medal of Honor to Maj. Merlyn H. Dethlefsen, a 100-mission F-105 pilot—the first winner of the nation's highest award to have won it over North Vietnam.

"He is a brave man, come to claim the honor his courage has earned," the President said of the quiet man in blue and his wife and young boy and girl.

"He is also a spokesman for the courage of thousands like him in Vietnam. This is also a special afternoon for many of them."

"They are not thinking of medals in face of a desperate enemy offensive. They are thinking of us. And they will not fall us, even if it means dying before another morning comes."

LBJ went on to speak of the men of the Pueblo, of those who gave their lives in defense of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon, and "Men who will throw back the enemy in the hills of Khesanh."

"He had a lot on his mind that day at the White House," the solemn young major reflected the other day as he drank a gingerale at the Dutch Treat Club luncheon.

It was probably the understatement of this winter of discontent. Like a lot of heroes, understatement is instinctive with Dethlefsen. Read what happened to him, one rough day last March:

He batted third in a three-plane attack on one of the strongest anti-aircraft complexes in North Vietnam.

The position bristled with Russian-built SAM missiles, capable of flying better than a thousand miles an hour faster than the F-105 must fly during a subsonic bomb run, as well

as heavy anti-aircraft artillery and all known varieties of automatic weapons.

This 600 gun arsenal had been assembled and put in operation to protect the Thai Nguyen steel works northeast of Hanoi, the enemy's most important source of steel.

On that day in March it was to be "taken out," if possible, by fighter-bombers. But first its defenses had to be "taken out."

It took some taking.

Dethlefsen's flight leader, first to go against the hot bed of resistance, was shot down on his first pass. When the second pilot went after it his F-105 was shot up so badly he was forced to stagger away in the direction of home.

That left Dethlefsen.

As he dived toward the smoking but still highly active position, a MIG-21, much faster than the heavily-loaded F-105, dived from a high position and took dead aim on his tail.

Dethlefsen calmly flew into the heaviest flak now streaking up at him from below, knowing that if the MIG kept after him the MIG faced an equal chance of being blasted out of the sky.

Bits of his F-105 were being shot away as he let go with bombs and 20mm cannon fire. He pulled out of the dive, shook off the MIG, threw in his afterburner and climbed for heaven.

He had made a hard decision. Because the smoke from his own bombs and secondary explosions in the defense complex obscured the ominous SAM launching positions, he would have to make a direct diving attack from above the site for better visibility.

Instantly, another MIG-21 was on his tail. In his efforts to escape death from above and below, the major lost sight of the SAM area.

He tried it a third time, then a fourth, each time losing more of his screaming jet. The flight of the fighter-bombers was approaching the steelworks, and the SAM site was still largely intact.

So, menaced by the MIG's and forced to fly through a blazing hailstorm of fire, he went back three more times and emptied everything he had on the enemy's position.

It was a shambles of exploding SAM's and ammunition when he pulled up, kicked in his afterburner, and streaked away in search of his tanker, somewhere over Northern Thailand.

Almost single-handedly, Dethlefsen had paved the way for the strikingly successful raid on the steel works by the wave of fighter bombers.

He landed his battered F-105 at Udorn, to the north of his home base at Takhli, took a look at it and decided it would hold together long enough to fly home.

"I was kind of tired that night," he told me. "So I had dinner and turned in."

Now his shooting war is over. The rangy Iowan who is a product of the University of Omaha teaches pilots at Vance AFB, Okla. As a holder of The Medal, a grateful nation gives him an extra hundred bucks a month.

Big of us.

Now Let's See

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents, a retired general, Rothwell H. Brown, writes a regular article in the

Rappahannock Record, a weekly newspaper published in Kilmarnock, Va.

This past week he referred to international events and expressed his opinion on the conduct of the war and our decreasing prestige abroad. This is a thoughtful article by a well-informed man and I submit it to the Members for their consideration:

Now Let's See

(By Rothwell H. Brown)

Only a fool can fail to see that the United States has now reached a point of crisis in its history which is probably of far greater importance than was the smashing victory of the Japanese at Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Today the United States faces a far greater peril than the confrontation with the military ambitions of Hitler and Tojo. Winston Churchill understood the terrible threat which the Soviet Union posed to world peace at the close of World War II. But he was summarily kicked out of office when he might have restrained the precipitate capitulation of the United States to Russian demands.

Secretary of State Dulles came the closest to awakening the American people and to forging an international defense against communist aggressive plans. Unfortunately, his early retirement and death led to communist-inspired repudiation of his tough policies directed towards collective world security.

The Russians have harnessed every man woman and child in Russia to their state program—the destruction of the United States and the conquest of the world. No internal suffering, no internal intellectual ferment, no internal dissent have been permitted to interfere with the long range plans of the Kremlin.

Science, technology and sheer manpower have all been directed towards the attainment of superiority in every aspect of military power which will permit them to overcome the United States without being destroyed in turn.

In addition to their unceasing efforts at home they have conducted a clandestine subversive campaign in the heartland of America. Over a period of 50 years trained and, unfortunately dedicated communist agents and supporters have been infiltrated into every stratum of American society and into every influential governmental, business, labor, cultural, educational, legal, racial and religious group in this country.

The American people are restless. The American people are afraid of the communist danger which they sense but cannot quite see or understand. The American people realize that something is definitely rotten in Denmark but are confused by propaganda and distortion and concealment of the truth.

Only our leadership seems unaware of the deadly nature of the Russian communist threat right here at home and throughout the world.

President Johnson seems totally incapable of breaking away from the pattern of appeasement, the pattern of "detente," the pattern of blind refusal to admit that we are under active Russian communist attack all over the world and in our own cities and hamlets.

We are now engaged in a war which we must not lose, for a defeat in Vietnam will bring the whole house of cards in the Pacific Ocean, the Indian Ocean and in the Mediterranean tumbling down like a haystack in a hurricane. Yet Washington, presumably under direct orders of the President suspended the bombing around Hanoi, Haiphong and the vast North Vietnamese military complex north of the DMZ during the entire period that South Vietnam was being torn asunder

in concentrated attacks against its city centers of political and economic power. Such colossal stupidity is unbelievable—yet no one seems to be unduly concerned.

The President and his Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, have so misjudged Russian communist intent and Russian Communist ambitions that they have permitted our military strength to deteriorate. General Westmoreland has been supported at an inadequate level, and now we dare not avenge the seizure of our naval ship, the Pueblo.

The stage is now being set to drive the United States out of Korea, out of Vietnam, out of the Middle East, out of the Mediterranean and back into Fortress America. In America the communist fifth column will egg on the racial extremists, the labor extremists, the religious-peacenik extremists and the soft-headed intellectuals and clerics, all of whom have been enlisted in the cause of communism to tear the country apart internally until we fall like Lenin predicted, a ripe plum plopping into communism's waiting hands.

It is much later than most people realize. Many people are beginning to doubt that there is sufficient time left in which to select a new leader and rally our forces into a unified confrontation with the evil power that seeks our destruction.

There is the gravest possibility that this country will cease to exist as a free and independent Republic without having celebrated its 200th birthday.

If General Westmoreland has miscalculated; if massive Russian arms support flowing through Haiphong has given the North Vietnamese a not improbable weapons superiority; if Khe Sanh turns out to be our Dien Bien Phu, then Washington will probably collapse just as did Paris. Our Dunkirk could follow quickly, and Armageddon would be just around the corner.

But assuming that the courage and skill of our fighting men save us at Khe Sanh, then the American people must, somehow or other, force President Johnson to move forward resolutely to victory over Ho Chi Minh, in North Vietnam. Military victory is not only possible; it can be lost only in Washington. The Senators Kennedy notwithstanding, we can win in North Vietnam, and we must win.

Resolution by Republican Club of Arlington, Va.

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the following resolution, which speaks for itself, was adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Va., at its meeting on February 14. Since the Postmaster General is now considering the possibility of issuing a commemorative postage stamp in proper recognition of the 50th anniversary of the independence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia—I hope that the spirited public interest this resolution exhibits will not be lost on the hierarchy at the Post Office Department.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION BY THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB
OF ARLINGTON, VA.

Whereas the year 1968 marks the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of inde-

pendence of the three Baltic States—Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; and

Whereas there exist historical, cultural, and family ties between the people of the Baltic States and the people of the United States; and

Whereas the occupation and subsequent annexation of the Baltic States by the Soviet Union is violative of both fundamental human rights and international law and has never been officially recognized by the United States and other nations of the free world; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States has overwhelmingly expressed its deep concern for the plight of the Baltic States, therefore

The Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia, requests the United States Post Office Department to issue a commemorative stamp to call the attention of the free world to the fiftieth anniversary of the proclamation of independence of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia.

Adopted by the Young Republican Club of Arlington, Virginia, February 14, 1968.

CLAUDE H. SMITH, JR.,

President.

CAROLIN PERSINGER,

Recording Secretary.

Attest:

Vermont May Prohibit All Billboards in State

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, during a time when there is such a great need for governments on all levels to face up to their responsibilities it is truly refreshing to learn that the State of Vermont is moving forward on its own beautification program.

The Wall Street Journal of February 19, 1968, has written about these efforts. It shows what can be done when people want to do something about beautifying their countryside.

The article referred to follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Feb. 19, 1968]

GOING BY THE BOARDS: VERMONT MAY PROHIBIT ALL BILLBOARDS IN STATE—MEASURE, LIKELY TO PASS SOON, AIMED AT PLEASING TOURISTS—FOE SEES TREND SPREADING

(By Jeremiah J. Mahoney)

MONTPELIER, Vt.—Vermont is a beautiful state. The drive up Route 5 along the Connecticut River is one of the prettiest drives in America. People journey from afar to view the fall foliage here. The sunsets are breathtaking.

But in recent years the view from Route 5 has been cluttered increasingly with signs advertising maple syrup and motels. The fall colors now come in flashing neon. And the setting sun now often slips slowly behind a billboard.

Soon, however, the signs may be gone. Vermont's 150-member House of Representatives is expected to vote this week on a bill that would eliminate all billboards except those on the premises of a place of business, and even those would be regulated as to size and shape. The state senate will consider the bill later. Passage seems likely.

"We won't permit the state to become a

honky-tonk," says Democratic Gov. Philip Hoff. "We want to preserve Vermont's natural beauty."

The bill is the most far-reaching effort in the U.S. to hurt billboards, and the billboard industry is naturally upset. "We will just have to close up shop," says Elmer Nadeau, president of Vermont Advertising Co. The company, which maintains 213 billboards, is the biggest outdoor advertising company in the state. W. Edson McKee, lobbyist for the industry in Vermont, complains that the bill is so sweeping that it would prohibit billboards even in commercial and industrial areas. He also fears that if the bill passes here, the movement might spread "to Maine, then New Hampshire and elsewhere."

"A GAME OF ONE-UPMANSHIP"

But nearly every group that has taken a stand is in favor of the bill. Even ski resort operations and hotel and motel operations, some of the biggest sign-putters in Vermont, favor the bill.

"Putting up billboards has become a game of one-upmanship," says Rep. Ted Riehle, who introduced the bill in the legislature. "One motel puts up two billboards, then another down the road puts up four. The first motel, not to be outdone, puts up three more. The first thing you know, each has about eight signs, neither has gained an advantage and the roadside has been cluttered up."

Such "cluttering," says Mr. Riehle, endangers the state's livelihood. Polls show that 65% of the travelers to Vermont come here because of the state's beauty. Revenue from tourism, about \$165 million a year, is the chief source of income for Vermonters. But tourists may quit coming here if they have to look for scenery behind billboards, Mr. Riehle contends.

To help tourists find motels, ski slopes and antique shops, the bill provides a variety of measures. Plazas would be built at busy gateways to the state and at other key locations, where information, maps and guidebooks would be available.

The state would also go into the billboard business itself, but in a sharply limited fashion. The highway department would erect and maintain "official business directional signs" that would carry information about businesses, including those serving travelers. The signs also would include information on scenic areas and cultural and educational facilities.

PRESENT SIGNS WOULD COME DOWN

The state would regulate the location, size, shape, color, lighting and manner of display and lettering of its signs. Businesses that wanted to be listed would pay a license fee of \$50 per sign the first year, with annual maintenance fees of \$10 to \$25 thereafter.

The billboards that already are up would eventually be torn down. Compensation would be paid in some cases. Also, the bill provides a grace period that would allow some signs to stay up for as long as five years after passage of the measure. Billboards that are more than five years old, however, would have to be taken down immediately.

The new law would also make life a little more difficult for those who continue to put up signs on their own premises. Placement, size and shape of the signs would be regulated by the Vermont measure. Even those series of signs—"Peas," "Beans," "Tomatoes," "Carrots," and "Corn"—that lead up to summer vegetable stands would be controlled.

The law would limit farmers' signs to four square feet, and the signs wouldn't be legal unless they were at least 100 feet apart. Originally, the bill would have limited farmers to just four roadside signs, but that provision was deleted after a hearing last week.

There aren't likely to be many violators of the law if it is passed in its present form. Current provisions provide for fines of up to \$100 and jail sentence of up to 30 days for each violation. Each day the illegal signs stayed up would be considered a separate offense.

Stone Mountain, Ga.

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, Stone Mountain, Ga., has been a point of great historical, recreational, and a phenomenon of great geological interest. Georgians have had a dream for many years to commemorate the leaders of the Confederacy by carving a bas relief of them on the face of the world's largest granite monolith, Stone Mountain.

It all began when the idea was inspired by the United Daughters of the Confederacy over 50 years ago.

In 1915, Gutzon Borglum was employed to plan a carving of colossal proportions depicting an army. Borglum began carving in June 1923. In January 1924, enough of the carving of General Lee was completed for Borglum, at an unveiling ceremony, to serve breakfast to a group of guests on Lee's massive shoulder. Shortly thereafter work was discontinued.

Augustus Lukeman, a sculptor, was then chosen to complete the carving.

Most of Borglum's unfinished work was blasted off the mountain to make way for a new design which was presented in April 1928. By midsummer 1928, due to financial difficulties, work was stopped.

In 1958, the State of Georgia adopted the project as an official State function. To improve the setting, 3,000 acres of surrounding land was acquired as a park in addition to the mountain itself.

Walter Hancock, of Gloucester, Mass., one of the Nation's leading sculptors, was retained for the completion of the work. Fortunately, the Lukeman models were still intact and available to assist Mr. Hancock.

Work on the carving is progressing rapidly and is set for unveiling by May 1969.

The Georgia State Legislature has passed a resolution requesting the Postmaster General to issue a stamp commemorating the completion of the carving. I am hereby inserting a copy of the resolution into the RECORD. I respectfully urge, as an American and Georgian, that the Stone Mountain memorial deserves to have a stamp issued in commemoration of completion.

The resolution follows:

H.R. 442

(By Messrs. Stalnaker of the 59th, Dollar of the 89th, Peterson of the 59th, Anderson of the 71st, Doster of the 73d, Bowen of the 69th, Collins of the 62d, and Ragland of the 109th)

Resolution requesting the United States Postmaster General to issue a postage stamp commemorating the historic carving on the

face of Stone Mountain; and for other purposes

Whereas, the historic carving on the face of Stone Mountain depicting Confederate President Jefferson Davis, General Robert E. Lee and General Thomas Jonathan (Stonewall) Jackson will be unveiled during 1968; and

Whereas, Stone Mountain is the largest granite monolith in the world; and

Whereas, when the carving is completed and thus combined with the natural phenomena of the mountain, Stone Mountain will truly rank as the eighth wonder of the world; and

Whereas, the historic carving is a fitting memorial to those who served and those who died in behalf of a cause that shaped the destiny of America; and

Whereas, the Stone Mountain Memorial Association has developed Stone Mountain into one of the most unique historical, educational and recreational facilities in the world.

Now, therefore be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia that this body does hereby request the United States Postmaster General to issue a postage stamp commemorating the historic carving on the face of Stone Mountain.

Be it further resolved that this body does further request that the United States Postmaster General issue such commemorative stamp at the Stone Mountain Post Office on the same day that the carving is unveiled.

Be it further resolved that the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to forward an appropriate copy of this Resolution to Honorable Lawrence O'Brien, United States Postmaster General; Honorable Lester G. Maddox, Governor, State of Georgia; Honorable Richard B. Russell, United States Senator, State of Georgia; Honorable Herman E. Talmadge, United States Senator, State of Georgia; Honorable G. Elliott Hagan, Representative, 1st Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Maston O'Neal, Representative 2nd Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Jack Brinkley, Representative, 3rd Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Ben B. Blackburn, Representative, 4th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Fletcher Thompson, Representative, 5th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable John J. Flynt, Jr., Representative, 6th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable John W. Davis, Representative, 7th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable W. S. Stuckey, Jr., Representative, 8th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Phil M. Landrum, Representative, 9th Congressional District, State of Georgia; Honorable Robert G. Stephens, Jr., Representative, 10th Congressional District, State of Georgia; and Honorable Phil Campbell, Chairman, Stone Mountain Memorial Association.

In House: Read and adopted January 15, 1968.

GLENN W. ELLARD,

Clerk.

In Senate: Read and adopted January 19, 1968.

HAMILTON MCWHORTER, Jr.,

Secretary.

Postsecondary Vocational Education Scholarship Amendments of 1968

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Postsecondary Voca-

tional Education Scholarship Amendments of 1968 which will further strengthen the Vocational Education Act of 1963 by permitting States more flexibility in administering the vocational postsecondary education programs by adding a system of scholarships administered by State boards of vocational education.

This amendment will translate into legislative action one of the recommendations of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education. In their report of last January, titled the "Bridge Between Man and His Work," the council proposed that—

The opportunity grant program of the Higher Education Act of 1965 should be extended to post-secondary technical and vocational programs by setting aside 25 percent of the funds appropriated for title IV of the act.

Rather than subtracting from the successful and desirable opportunity grant program, this amendment proposes instead the addition, or extension, of the opportunity grant concept for vocational students.

In President Johnson's state of the Union message of January 17, 1968, he justifiably pointed with pride to the fact that:

Today more than half of the high school graduates go on to college.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am equally concerned with the plight of the nearly one-half of our high school graduates who do not go on to college. Of course, I am not alone, in my concern, and some constructive steps on behalf of these non-college-bound students have already been taken.

Dr. Grant Venn, Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Adult and Vocational Education of the U.S. Office of Education, in his 1964 book, "Man, Education, and Work," noted this imbalance in our system of student financial aid. Dr. Venn said:

Tragically, the nation's educational system is, when viewed as a whole, in what Edward Chase describes as a gross imbalance, its attention concentrated on the 20 percent of students who go through college.

In 1965, through the inspiration of my esteemed colleague, the Honorable JOHN DENT, this House passed without a dissenting vote a bill which has since become the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act. That was a first giant step. Today I propose a second constructive step: Adding an innovative system of State-administered scholarships to the present system of insured bank loans.

In President Johnson's education message of February 5, 1968, he again noted that—

More than 50 percent of our high school graduates went on to college.

But the President also called for "new approaches to job training" in his recommendations for new strength for vocational education.

Mr. Speaker, I support and urge passage of those proposals which are designed to support and improve our educational institutions, our high schools, vocational schools, technical institutes,

and community colleges. But I feel we can also provide direct aid to the vocational student himself, just as we have done for students in higher education. This can be done economically, expeditiously, and efficiently through a system of State-administered vocational student scholarships.

It is with a great deal of satisfaction that I find myself in accord with a most articulate gentleman whose philosophy generally places him at a point in the political spectrum far removed from my own.

Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., in his column of January 15, 1968, in the Washington Evening Star, wrote:

Let us admit that if the state were to give each child a voucher, on the order of what is given to veterans under the GI Bill of Rights, cashable for sum X at any accredited school, that there would be massive redeployments of children in all the major centers of the United States.

Though I have never done a head count, I feel sure that, like myself, many of the Members of this House—and of the other body—have personally benefited from the GI bill of World War II and of Korea. I would propose for postsecondary vocational students what might be called a civilian bill of scholarships to be administered in the States, at the State level under a State plan for students in that State. Need would be the criteria.

Proud as we are of the increasing numbers and percentages of students who enter college, we must also be concerned for those who enter—but drop out.

In his book Dr. Venn asked:

And what happens to them when they leave? Turned out of an educational system oriented toward someone else's college degree rather than their own work needs, and entering a labor market whose jobs require constantly higher levels of education and skill development, their prospects are bleak.

An excellent article on this subject, "College Dropouts: Successes or Failures," by Donald H. Ford and Hugh B. Urban appeared in the spring, 1965, issue of the Educational Record published by the prestigious American Council on Education.

Two excerpts from that article are relevant to the intent of my measure.

We will also argue that attendance at a university or college is an appropriate way for some, but not all, people to develop themselves and their careers. Across the land we have hundreds of young men and women who are coaxed and wheedled into going away to college—youngsters who are not academically oriented; who do not learn well under the circumstances provided by the typical university with its highly formalized system of abstract instruction, course requirements, credit structures, and the like; or whose career aspirations actually call for an entirely different kind of background from that provided by our colleges and universities. For students such as these, the decision to leave college may represent a constructive act, a step toward a more productive, meaningful life. The error will have occurred in the decision to undertake a college education in the first place.

Our college dropouts are trying to tell us something. Our total educational system is inadequate—there are some gaps in it. We,

as educators, have oversold the concept of a college education representing it as the single preferred method of becoming educated. We have encouraged our fellow citizens to believe this, and we have failed to foster alternative avenues of career and educational development throughout our society. It is not true that any youngster with a high IQ who doesn't go to college represents a loss of talent to our society. Universities aren't the only place where people can learn things. A college education isn't the only avenue to a personally meaningful and socially productive life.

During the 1965 hearings on the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act I learned that approximately 20 percent of the students in accredited business schools have enrolled after having one or more semesters of study in 4-year colleges or universities. This, of course, is only one possible constructive alternative for those who find college not to be the answer. There should be access, free of financial pressures, to the trade and technical schools of this country and to the terminal occupational programs conducted by our community and junior colleges.

The past president of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, Dr. Kenneth B. Hoyt, noted the important role of the guidance counselor in helping students. In the February 1967 issue of the Delta Pi Epsilon Journal he said:

A counselor's proper function is to supply students with an understanding of opportunities and then to help the student arrive at his own decision. A good high school counselor should not feel a special commitment to a business school, a junior college, a public vocational school, or any other type of post high school educational opportunity.

Like Dr. Hoyt, I have no special commitment to any particular type of institution that is providing educational opportunity. But I feel strongly that this bill can open up new opportunities for the nearly 50 percent of our high school graduates who do not go to college and the 40 percent of college entrants who do not graduate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to study this measure carefully and join me in expanding the student opportunities for postsecondary vocational education.

The material referred to above follows: HIGHLIGHTS OF POSTSECONDARY VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SCHOLARSHIP AMENDMENTS OF 1968

1. Provides for a program of 2-year scholarships for postsecondary vocational education students, administered by State boards of vocational education under approved State plans, but with selection of recipients for scholarship awards to be made by a State selection committee. Selectees could attend any eligible institution (defined as in the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act) of their choice that admits them.

2. Appropriations authorized would be \$100 million for each of 5 years, beginning with FY 1970, to pay initial-year stipends to scholarship holders, plus necessary appropriations for their second academic year. Financing would be 100% Federal, including cost of State plan administration. (For FY 1969, appropriations to finance State plans would be authorized.) Of the sums appropriated, up to 2% would be allotted to Puerto Rico and the territories; the remainder would be allotted among the States on the basis of

relative numbers of students graduating from public or other nonprofit high schools.

3. The amount of the stipend would be determined annually for each student on the basis of his financial need (without regard to tuition and fees of any particular institution). Maximum stipend per year: \$800, plus \$200 in the second year for students who were in the upper half of their class in the preceding year. No stipend payable if the need is below \$200.

4. Candidates would, generally, enter competition for awards while still in high school, and the State scholarship selection committee would make selections solely on the basis of superior ability to pursue successfully a course of study at an eligible institution determined in accordance with objective measurement of ability and achievement. Selectees would be ranked according to relative standing in the competition, and first-year stipends would be determined for those who need them, going down the list until available funds are exhausted. Those on the list not receiving an initial-year stipend would receive a certificate of scholarship.

5. In order to make for an equitable geographical distribution of scholarships and scholarship funds within a State, a State plan could provide for allocation of scholarship funds among school districts or other attendance areas on the basis of public and private high school enrollment or some other equitable basis.

Vice President H. H. Humphrey Speaks to Dallas National Conference

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of attending the National Democratic Conference in Dallas, Tex., on February 9 and listening to the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable HUBERT HUMPHREY address the conference.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. HUMPHREY's speech, as follows:

REMARKS OF VICE PRESIDENT HUBERT HUMPHREY, DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONFERENCE, DALLAS, TEX., FEBRUARY 9, 1968

Most of you will recall the late Bob Thornton, four times Mayor of Dallas.

In his later years, he chose carefully between those meetings he would attend and those he would pass up.

He used to say: "If it's a do meetin', I'm goin'." If it's a don't meetin', I'm staying home."

This is going to be a "do" meeting, and it is going to be a "do" year for Democrats.

We have some important assets in 1968—not least, our opposition, the grumbling old party itself.

They have already renewed their familiar refrain: "Me too." "Enough for now." "Time for a pause."

They are for all the right things.

They are for health—but they voted 93 percent against Medicare in the House of Representatives.

Education? Oh, yes. But three quarters of their representatives voted against the elementary and secondary education act in 1965.

Cities? They want to improve them—but

88 per cent voted against model cities in the House of Representatives.

They have some window-dressing progressives. But you know—and the people know—what's for sale inside. Remnants, and a few bottles of Geritol for the faithful.

But we have more important assets than our opposition. We have a record we can take to the people.

We have the Medicare program—something we've been working for since Harry Truman's day. Today decent medical care is the right of almost 20 million older Americans. Seven and a half million senior Americans received care under it in the last fiscal year alone.

How long did we fight for Federal aid to elementary and secondary education? We passed it in 1965, and 9 million needy American children got substantial help last year because of it.

Social Security: We passed it in the first place over desperate opposition. And we brought another million needy Americans out of poverty a few weeks ago by expanding its benefits.

There is aid to higher education—and a million and a quarter needy students in college on public grants and loans because of it.

The minimum wage was ours too—twenty-five cents at first, and now a dollar sixty.

A Peace Corps—a Teacher Corps—Head Start for disadvantaged pre-schoolers—a nationwide youth opportunity program:

What does it all mean? A grandmother living out her days in dignity and security. Not pauperized by medical costs; a Mexican-American child who gets special help in language instructions; a chance for a Negro mother to keep her family together; a poor teenager who can look ahead to college rather than the street corner.

It all means dignity and opportunity—the right of free choice—for more and more individual Americans.

And how is it all done? Not for people, but with people . . . not by the Federal Government alone, but by helping revitalize State and local Government.

It is done through and by the free enterprise system that has made this country what it is today.

It is done through private organizations.

Did you know, for example, that over 90 percent of the community action agencies using Federal War on Poverty funds are Churches, civic groups, inner-city community groups, and not Government agencies at all?

This new spirit of partnership and cooperation is part of our record.

And so is prosperity.

Everybody knows about our 83 months of unbroken economic expansion . . . and that unemployment is now at its lowest point in 15 years.

But do they know that real personal incomes have grown more in every single year since 1961 than they grew in the five years from 1956 to 1961 together?

I'm proud of that record.

And I don't mind reminding you that it is prosperity we are trying to protect today with the President's program to fight inflation. (A major part of that program, by the way, is the President's request for a temporary tax surcharge. It needs your help.)

Yes, we have a record to stand on and to put before the people:

This Administration has invested twice as much in help for education since 1963 as was invested in the previous century.

This nation is now investing over twice what it was in 1961 to help poor Americans lift themselves out of poverty. And ten million Americans have crossed that threshold since 1961 as a result.

Our investment in health is now three times what it was in 1964.

Not enough? Maybe not. There are of course limitations to what can be undertaken at any one time.

But we are doing so much more today than anybody did during the stagnant 1950's . . . so much more than any of us thought possible a few short years ago, that I find it hard to feel discouraged.

You don't get that kind of progress by accident. You get it with leadership that is ready to invest in a better, stronger, healthier America.

You don't get that kind of progress from timid guardians of the status quo and economies of stagnation. And Americans know it. * * *

So much for the record. There's a lot more, and I urge you to learn it and use it.

But you know and I know that the American people don't vote for yesterday . . . especially at a time when this nation faces serious challenges both at home and abroad.

1968 is going to be a year for serious debate about the future—not the past—of America.

Do we mean to pursue policy of security and development at home and abroad? Or are we going to draw back from our commitment to a better life in a safer world?

Do we as the richest, strongest nation in the world mean to lead in mankind's struggle for freedom from want, freedom from ignorance, freedom from fear?

Or are we ready to turn selfishly inward . . . to forget others . . . and leave this country and the world divided between rich and poor . . . healthy and sick . . . hopeful and despairing . . . peaceful and seething . . . threatening and threatened?

These are the challenges of 1968.

The Johnson-Humphrey Administration does not seek to evade those challenges.

We shall meet them.

For, as Harry Truman said in another time of trial: "If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world, and we shall surely endanger the welfare of the nation."

President Lyndon Johnson has a program to meet those challenges here in America and in the world. You have seen some of it in his messages to Congress, and there is more to come.

There is a Manpower Program designed to wipe out most of the hard-core unemployment in this country by 1971.

That is no costly stop-gap, make-work, public-sponsored palliative. It is based on a partnership between Government and industry—industry to do the training and provide the jobs, Government to pay the extra costs of training.

It is not too much to say that this new Manpower Program will test the vitality of our free enterprise system.

Can it make room for half a million workers who have never before had the dignity and opportunity that goes with a productive, steady job? I think so.

In education: An educational opportunity act to assure "that in America there will be no economic or racial barrier to higher education; that every qualified young person will have all the education he wants and can absorb." More funds for Head Start . . . full funding for bi-lingual education programs . . . support to states for vocational training . . . a stay-in-school program . . . and much more.

Civil Rights: There are a lot of people in this country today who are mad at President Johnson and the rest of us Democrats because they think we've moved too far, too fast on Civil Rights.

One of the Republican Presidential candidates, reincarnated and true to his party's

historic position, says: "Enough for now, time to consolidate our past gains."

And there is a third party candidate who says Republicans and Democrats alike have wrecked a comfortable and genteel way of life, and that he's going to restore it.

Well, I want to be perfectly frank with you.

When you declare that all Americans are equal before the law and at the polls . . . when you make your commitment to the emancipation proclamation not as a promise but as a reality, you do raise expectations and you do encourage change.

Change is coming. It is good for the health of this free country of ours. And we are for it.

When you ask Negro-Americans and Spanish-Americans, among others, to risk and give their lives for their buddies and their country, they will not—and should not—be expected to move to the back of the opportunity bus when they come home.

The challenge—and the responsibility of every American—is to make that change peaceful and constructive, to the benefit of all.

So this year's Civil Rights message asks Congress to help "complete the task it has begun," . . . to prohibit violent interference with Civil Rights . . . a strong equal employment opportunity commission . . . non-discrimination in jury selection . . . equal opportunity in housing.

Crime: The President declared just two days ago that 1968 is the year when "the forces of law and order must capture the initiative in the battle against crime."

He called on the 90th Congress to give the American people "the security that they demand and the justice that they deserve."

The President's message on crime will contain a 22-point program for action now—gun control . . . the safe streets and crime control bill . . . and much else drastically to improve the law enforcement capabilities of the State and local authorities responsible for public safety in this Country.

Meanwhile, all Federal law enforcement agencies have been unified under the Attorney General. The President has asked Congress for a powerful bureau of narcotics and dangerous drugs to prevent, in his words, "The sale of slavery to the young."

Were you waiting for dramatic new programs? Those are dramatic programs, and there are more messages yet to come.

They are dramatic.

They are Democratic.

They are the building blocks of a better, stronger, freer, safer America.

I for one mean to fight for them from this day until next November and beyond, and I hope you will be with me. * * *

What about the challenges we face abroad?

Those are the ones that concern Americans most today.

The masterplans for world peace—and even for local peace—are plentiful. But they don't always fit the realities that confront us.

What is the answer?

To withdraw and let the fate of a nuclear-armed world be decided without us?

Or to take the more difficult road of active engagement in pursuit of the fundamental human aspirations we have always stood for. Freedom from want. Freedom from fear. Self-determination. Social justice. Security. Stable and lasting peace.

America has chosen the latter path, as indeed it must, knowing full-well that, in the words of John F. Kennedy, "Peace and freedom do not come cheap, and we are destined—all of us here today—to live out most if not all of our lives in uncertainty and challenge and peril."

We have believed that challenge accepted is safer than challenge ignored . . . that

perils recognized are safer than perils denied . . . that peace and freedom are worth the sacrifice we may sometimes be called on to make.

Such a commitment requires a leader. This Country has it in President Lyndon Johnson.

He has the courage to meet our National responsibilities when others may waver.

He is unafraid to make a lonely decision when others afford the luxury of the second-guess.

And I believe that when the American people, this November, measure President Lyndon Johnson against any of the alternative choices, they will decide that his leadership is needed—both at home and in the world—for another four years.

The Presidency of the United States is no place for any image-maker's make-believe creation. Nor is it a place for men whose basic philosophy is out of tune with the times and with the needs of the next century.

It is a big job. It calls for a big man with a mind and heart big enough to do that job when the going gets tough.

We have our candidate. He is President Lyndon Johnson. With your support, he will lead our party to victory this November. And we will get on with the unfinished business of building a stronger, freer, safer Country—and a more peaceful world—for the Americans of the years to come.

Arkansas Careers, Inc.

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the January 12, 1968, issue of the Christian Science Monitor had the following article about a unique organization that has been in operation in Arkansas for the past several years:

HOW AND WHY

Arkansas Careers, Inc., is living up to its name.

It has been operating with a paid staff for only 18 months. But already it's found positions in Arkansas for 300 college graduates who normally would have left the State. And it has enticed back home to positions in Arkansas 200 grads who already had found jobs elsewhere.

What makes the organization unique is that it is financed entirely by private funds contributed by 600 Arkansas firms. And it charges no fees for job placement.

W. F. Rector, its president, and some other Arkansas businessmen grew weary of educating executives for other states. So they put the organization together informally three years ago. It quickly proved itself.

Today its executive secretary roams the state, talking to civic clubs and college groups.

Bimonthly news letters go out to college grads now in military service informing them of job openings back home. And businesses get a monthly report giving thumbnail sketches of Arkansans who are leaving the service, finishing college, or working out of state but wanting to come home.

It started back in 1960 when a group of civic and student leaders decided it was time somebody got busy to help young

Arkansans find careers at home and, at the same time, assist businesses to fill available positions with Arkansas college graduates. Today that organization has a paid staff, has the financial support of over 600 Arkansas business firms, and has successfully aided young graduates find jobs they want and helped Arkansas business firms to employ capable and talented young people they need.

It is a pleasure to salute the fine Arkansans who comprise the officers and board of directors of Arkansas Careers: Mr. W. F. Rector, president; Mr. Dave Grunfest, vice president; Mr. Dabbs Sullivan, vice president; Mr. San Anderson, secretary-treasurer, and Mr. Porter Briggs, executive secretary.

Gov. Winthrop Rockefeller is chairman of the board and the members are Mr. S. J. Beauchamp, Jr., of Little Rock; Mr. John Carruthers of Pine Bluff; Mr. R. N. Dills of Fort Smith; Mr. Alexander Harris of Little Rock; Mr. Howard Holt-hoff of Gould; Mr. Larry Kelley of Little Rock; Mr. Ed Ligon, Jr., of Little Rock; Mr. Frank Lyon of Little Rock; Mrs. Mary McLeod of Morrilton; Mr. Russell Marks of El Dorado; Mr. Joe Martin of Pocahtontas; Dr. Joseph A. Norton of Little Rock; Mrs. Dorothy Stuck of Marked Tree; and Mr. Everett Tucker, Jr., of Little Rock.

The purposes of Arkansas Careers, Inc., may be stated briefly as, first, exposing college and university students to career opportunities within the State; second, assisting young men, serving their military obligation, in finding careers in Arkansas after discharge from active duty; third, assisting graduates, working out of Arkansas, to return home to work; fourth, helping businessmen find employees for specific positions; and fifth, sponsoring the annual Arkansas career days interviewing sessions.

The annual Arkansas career days are designed to give students exposure to career opportunities in Arkansas and to give businessmen an opportunity to interview students and graduates interested in working in Arkansas. Thus far the organization has worked with over 2,000 college graduates and has been directly responsible for the placement of more than 500 college graduates in virtually all fields of endeavor.

The military newsletter goes to Arkansans in the military service and keeps them abreast of economic happenings in the State. It keeps the young military servicemen aware of the employment opportunities available to him when he has completed his military obligation.

In addition to the military newsletter, Arkansas Careers publishes a monthly newsletter which goes to over 1,100 businesses throughout the State. This newsletter lists the qualifications of individuals who are interested in working in Arkansas. Over 1,500 résumés of prospective employees have been sent to Arkansas businessmen in the past 15 months as a result of the feedback from this newsletter.

Arkansas Careers, Inc., through its officers and board members, its paid staff

and its participating business firms, is making a real contribution to the future of Arkansas. This effort by Arkansas business is in the highest tradition of individual enterprise.

Questionnaire

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this week I placed in the mail my annual questionnaire to approximately 225,000 residents of the 10th Congressional District of Florida, which I have the honor to represent here in the Congress.

This is a time of crisis for our country. Taxes are increasing; anarchy and crime is rising; and America's prestige in the world is at its lowest ebb.

These are times when all Americans should inform their elected Representatives of their desires in legislative matters. The right to vote provides only occasional opportunity to express one's self in government, whereas the continuous response of the public on issues facing our Nation greatly strengthens our system.

This is a critical year for the American people, and I thought my colleagues would be interested in the subjects questioned:

	Yes	No
1. Do you support the administration's proposed 10 percent increase in income tax?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Which of the following fiscal policies should the United States follow—		
(a) Impose a surtax on income?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Reduce appropriations for existing programs?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Postpone new domestic programs?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Encourage foreigners to visit the United States?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Do you favor the proposal for a federally guaranteed annual income regardless of whether the recipient works or is capable of working?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Do you favor the recent bill I introduced which encourages the employment and training of the unskilled by a partnership between Federal Government and private industry where employers would be refunded part of the minimum wages paid the worker during the training period?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. To reduce crime, anarchy, and disorder in our country do you favor—		
(a) Wiretapping in the investigation of organized crime?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(b) Larger appropriations to slum areas?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(c) Better enforcement of existing laws?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(d) Additional criminal laws?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(e) Government jobs for the unemployed?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. If you believe Federal spending and domestic programs should be reduced by the administration and if the administration fails to make such reductions, do you believe Congress should vote these reductions in spending?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Would you favor curbing the power of the President to commit U.S. troops to war without specific prior approval of Congress?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Do you support President Johnson's proposal to restrict foreign travel and the suggested 15 and 30 percent tax on all moneys above \$7 per day spent overseas as a method of reducing our balance-of-payment deficit?.....	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Note.—Optional:

Sex: M .. F ..; party preference: Republican .. Democrat .. Independent ..; age 20 to 24 ..; 25 to 44 ..; 45 to 64 ..; 65 and up ..

District of Columbia Police Need Educational Pay Incentives

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I am confident all of us would gladly testify to the importance of education in encouraging and preserving the values of our free and democratic society.

This is true because we recognize the importance of giving the best possible education to our children so that they can cope with the enormous challenges which will confront them tomorrow.

It is equally true because we have come to appreciate the value of continual growth and learning on the part of our present leaders and the general public as we attempt to meet the responsibilities of today.

Doctors, lawyers, educators, leaders of business and industry, and every private citizen with a stake in his community and country at large realize that education must be a continuing process.

And, events in recent months and years have taught us that nowhere is the need for increased understanding and knowledge more urgent than in the administration of this country's urban areas, where over 70 percent of our people live.

In particular, we have come to appreciate the highly complex nature of urban law enforcement and the great demands it makes upon those charged with the maintenance of law and order—our policemen.

Today's problems in crime control and law enforcement cannot be solved with yesterday's answers. Modern policework demands the highest order of talent and education.

Yet, strangely, we find that on Monday this House will be asked to approve a pay raise bill for District of Columbia policemen from which have been stricken educational pay incentives.

Such action, in my opinion, cannot be justified in the light of this Nation's clearly defined and recognized priorities. I think we should all support efforts to amend the bill on the floor and restore these incentives.

Simply stated, the amendments would provide \$600 more yearly for officers who have completed 30 to 60 hours of college work in law enforcement and an additional \$1,200 after 60 hours have been completed. Some modest recruiting incentives, such as payment of preemployment interview expenses, also would be provided.

I believe I am in good company in endorsing these incentives. They were in the original bill offered by the chairman of the House District Committee, of which I am a member, and then removed in executive committee session.

No testimony against the educational pay incentives appears in the record of the committee hearings on this measure.

Furthermore, when it became apparent that the educational pay incentives for District policemen were in danger, I solicited the opinions of two highly informed and responsible agencies.

One, the International Association of Chiefs of Police Inc., noted:

The policy of this Association has long been one of full and active support for the concept of college education for police officers.

The other response, from the Justice Department, cited President Johnson's emphasis on a "specific program of fellowships, student loans and tuition aid for State and local law enforcement officers."

Because of the valuable contribution to the discussion of educational pay incentives for police made by the Police Chiefs Association and the Department of Justice, I would like to share their two letters with my colleagues in the House:

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF CHIEFS OF POLICE, INC.,

Washington, D.C., February 7, 1968.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: It is with mixed emotion that I take this opportunity to comment on the recent action of the House District Subcommittee with respect to H.R. 10761 in the matter of police-fire pay. While increased compensation for police officers is well deserved and long overdue, I cannot avoid expressing considerable alarm at the Subcommittee's rejection of incentive pay programs.

The policy of this Association has long been one of the full and active support for the concept of college education for police officers. We recognize the need not only for more police officers, but for better police officers and in the long run we can only hope to improve the quality of the nation's police through educational programs designed to meet the needs of modern law enforcement. Our position was most effectively stated by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice when it reported:

"It is nonsense to state or to assume that the enforcement of the law is so simple that it can be done best by those unencumbered by a study of the liberal arts. The man who goes into our streets in hopes of regulating, directing or controlling human behavior must be armed with more than a gun and the ability to perform mechanical movements in response to a situation. Such men as these engage in the difficult, complex and important business of human behavior. Their intellectual armament—so long restricted to the minimum—must be no less than their physical prowess and protection."

Needless to say, we can hardly hope to attract college students into police careers or to encourage present officers to improve themselves professionally through college work unless we are willing to reward additional capabilities with additional pay. The concept of incentive pay for education is not a new one. In mid-March of last year, the United States Civil Service Commission issued a directive permitting certain college graduates to be paid higher starting salaries than usual for their particular entrance grade. In doing this the Civil Service Commission was responding to the needs of federal agencies which are finding it increasingly difficult to compete with industry for promising young persons.

Educational incentive pay plans are cur-

rently in effect in over twenty of the nation's police agencies and under study in dozens more. I strongly urge your careful consideration of and support for incentive pay for District police personnel. Since our Nation's Capital is so far below its authorized manpower, I would suggest that virtually any recruitment methods are necessary and would urge that the recruit incentive provisions also be restored to the bill.

With a view to the ultimate objective of better law enforcement, let us design a pay program that will provide over the months and years ahead for better police personnel capable of dealing with complex social problems and providing the citizens and visitors of the District of Columbia with the finest police service available.

Sincerely yours,

QUINN TAMM,
Executive Director.

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
ATTORNEY GENERAL,

Washington, D.C., February 8, 1968.

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JACOBS: I am pleased to respond to your request for the views of the Department of Justice on whether salary incentives should be provided for District of Columbia policemen to attend law enforcement or police administration courses at colleges or universities.

As you know, yesterday the President outlined for the Congress his program of action to meet the challenge of crime in our society. High on the President's list of things to be done was enactment of the Safe Streets bill amended to establish a specific program of fellowships, student loans and tuition aid for state and local law enforcement officers. This proposal reflects the President's interest in assuring that law enforcement officers who wish to do so may further their education. As the President said, law enforcement "means more than putting on a uniform".

It would seem to us that the program contemplated by the President would increase the effectiveness of law enforcement people throughout the country, and incentive pay for those who further their professional education would stimulate interest in the program.

You also asked whether a higher rate of pay for a law enforcement officer having college credits in law enforcement would impair the morale of his brother officers who do not receive a similar rate of pay because they do not have college credits. With regard to the particular situation in the District of Columbia, we would expect that District officials could better answer that question. We would hope there would be no adverse effect upon morale. Certainly, if incentive pay were provided not only for those who enter the police force with college credits but also for those who further their education in law enforcement or police administration while on the force, we would expect that morale would be improved. In such an event, every man would know that he has an opportunity to increase his salary by undertaking available self-improvement.

Your attention is invited to the February 1968 issue of "Law and Order", which contains a survey of trends in police education. Reporting on 287 police departments serving communities with populations varying from under 2500 to over 100,000, the magazine states that from a low of 12% to a high of 22% provide pay incentives.

I am taking the liberty of forwarding a copy of this letter to Congressman Whitener, since he is the Chairman of the Subcommit-

tee that has jurisdiction of the legislation involved.

Sincerely,

WARREN CHRISTOPHER,
Deputy Attorney General.

Historic Church, Patriotic Padre

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include a magnificent column by Dr. Paul H. Hallett, an associate editor of the National Register, a religious publication fair to people of all religious faiths and respectful of those who have none.

This column by Dr. Hallett was featured in the National Register, a weekly newspaper that circulates on six continents on Sunday, February 18, 1968. The piece in the National Register has been noted with warm commendation by leaders in church and state, including prelates, pastors, the clergy generally, youthful, middle aged, and those in the ranks of veterans in their golden years.

It is a special joy for me to bring this column to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in both Chambers, the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate, because "the padre of the Americas," on numerous occasions, has invoked the blessing of God in both Houses of the Congress. As Speaker JOHN W. MCCORMACK, in his great-hearted, noble fashion declared in this body on Monday, February 19, 1968:

The Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning is one of the best known and most beloved servants of God and of The People of God in The Western Hemisphere.

It is good to note that a column in a newspaper that is nationally and internationally recognized for truth and fairness should describe a "country pastor, whose parish is the world," in terms that we know to be true.

This is my joyful privilege in connection with the official celebration of George Washington's birthday.

The article reads as follows:

HISTORIC CHURCH, PATRIOTIC PASTOR

(By Dr. Paul H. Hallett)

What might be called the mother church of the U.S. is in danger of being engulfed by a French metals empire, the Howmet Corporation, which plans to erect an aluminum factory near St. Josephs-on-Carrollton Manor Church in historic Frederick, Md. The pastor, who is as American as his church, is fighting an uphill battle to delay the rezoning of the 1,400 acres once owned by Charles Carroll for industrial use. He is the Rev. Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, who is known to everybody in official Washington and was called by Senator Mike Mansfield, for richly deserved reasons, "the Padre of the Americas."

The parish of St. Josephs-on-Carrollton Manor was erected in 1811 by Archbishop John Carroll, the founder of the American Hierarchy. The land on which it rests was donated by his cousin, Charles.

Besides Charles Carroll, St. Josephs-on-Carrollton included among its original members two signers of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, Daniel Carroll, brother of the Archbishop, and Thomas Fitzsimons. What other church in the Americas could claim so illustrious a patronage?

Two things distinguish Father Thorning: A sturdy faith and an ardent patriotism. He warned of Communist penetration in Guatemala in 1954, long before the experts were aware of it, and he saw through the Communist Castro while other Catholics were seeing in him a protagonist of the Social Encyclicals. For 22 years he has been pastor of St. Josephs-on-Carrollton-Manor. At a time when the once glorious link between Catholicism and patriotism is being weakened, I can wish the valiant pastor of St. Josephs-on-Carrollton few better auguries than that he may save his storied church against the encroachments of foreign industrialism.

Prosecutions in the Napco Case— Continued

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on Monday of this week I wrote to the Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, expressing satisfaction over action begun several days ago by the Justice Department to recover funds from Napco Industries, Inc., of Minneapolis, the firm that got paid by the Agency for International Development for delivering almost \$4 million worth of automobile parts to India—most of which turned out to be worthless junk. In my letter I expressed the hope that Justice would not be content with taking civil action alone, but that criminal prosecutions against the parties to this obviously fraudulent transaction would also ensue. I asked the Attorney General for a report on this subject. I am pleased to note that the Washington Post in an editorial in today's edition also calls for consideration of criminal prosecutions in connection with the Napco scandal.

The editorial follows:

THE NAPCO CASE

The Department of Justice has rightly decided to move against Napco Industries, Inc., in an effort to recover money involved in the company's operations in connection with a Development Loan Fund financing of an Indian gear plant.

The Department, in its complaint, alleges that Napco machinery involved was given an excessive appraisal and that services to be performed and materials to be delivered were not forthcoming. It is contended that the tools involved were given a fair market value of \$909,000 in 1960, but the figure used in the application was an estimated replacement figure of \$3,724,000.

"From the time of the submission of the application," the Department complains, "through the execution of the loan agreement . . . the officers and agents of the defendant knowingly and deliberately engaged in a scheme and conspiracy to deceive the plaintiff's agents as to the existence of the aforementioned fair market value ap-

praisal." It condemns "deceitful and wrongful acts by defendant's officers and agents."

These allegations, if confirmed in the forthcoming legal action the Department of Justice has now instituted, constitute a shocking perversion of the purposes of the aid program and an appalling deceit upon that program's administrators.

The Department of Justice in proceeding with this case is demonstrating a commendable indifference as to the prestige of those it suspects of wrongdoing. And if its civil actions are successful it ought to consider the advisability of proceeding to criminal prosecutions where warranted.

Tolerating Crime

HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, according to the Washington Post of January 31, crime in the District of Columbia was up 32 percent in December 1967, over the rate for the same month in the preceding year.

If this figure is even a glim reflection of the national rate, perhaps at long last Congress will take the action needed to unshackle police and to prevent convicted criminals from escaping punishment.

There is little use dwelling on the District's miseries, for any respectable citizen who resides here knows the danger of going out at night or of leaving doors or windows unlocked. Pedestrians would be safer after dark on busy highways than they are on the streets of Washington.

For the Nation as a whole, the crime rate increased 29 percent in the years 1963-66. Unless the 1967 tabulation shows a trend distinctly more favorable to law and order, the new concept of treating criminals with exaggerated solicitude must be terminated. The Nation's biggest crime is tolerating crime.

The first duty of Congress is remove the unrealistic and unjust restrictions on officers of the law that have come about through a Supreme Court which has demonstrated greater sympathy for law-breakers than for the general public. At the same time we must close wherever possible the ridiculous legal loopholes woven by court decisions.

House Joint Resolution 418, to authorize Congress, by a two-thirds vote in each House, to override decisions of the Supreme Court, will give the legislative branch an opportunity to return this Government to the laws and traditions that provided this country with security against lawlessness until recent years. The resolution needs to be acted upon with dispatch.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I should like to insert four editorials in the RECORD. The first, "Unpunished Murder," is from the Evening Star of February 6. The second, "Character of Society," appeared in the Derrick, Oil City-Franklin-Clarion, Pa., February 7.

The third, "Crime in Our Streets," was published in Nation's Agriculture. The fourth, "Making It Easy for the Criminal," is from a recent editorial of the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The latter publication cites a Philadelphia police report attributing 40 percent of all violent crimes in the city during 1965 to persons who had been convicted at least twice for previous lawless acts. The figure is another indication that current court leniency is an invitation to repeat robbery, rape, and murder.

Courts are also too quick to excuse first offenders. To correct a child, the wise parent does not give him a loving tap on the head for doing something wrong. Rather, he applies a poignant rap elsewhere. This method of chastisement should not be overlooked in dealing with communities of young punks who have come to believe that crime is a convenient way of life in this indulgent society.

The editorials follow:

[From the Evening Star, Feb. 6, 1968]

UNPUNISHED MURDER

With obvious reluctance, a District Judge last week freed the self-confessed killer of the widow of James F. Mitchell, a prominent Washington physician.

What this miscarriage of justice puts before us is a shocking example of the Mallory Rule at work—the rule which, to the dismay of this community's "liberal" element, has been modified to some extent by Title III of the new District crime law.

Mrs. Mitchell was suffocated in her Dupont Circle home two years ago by Harry Gross in a dispute over money. Gross, a handyman, confessed after lie detector tests had pointed to him as the guilty party. Now, there was no claim that any third degree tactics had been used by the police, no contention that the confession was not voluntary. And, of course, there was nothing at all to indicate that the jury had found an innocent man guilty of this murder.

The police, however, had waited four hours after the lie detector tests before taking Gross to a magistrate for arraignment. And this delay, under the blindly mechanical operation of the Mallory Rule, was held by the Court of Appeals to necessitate reversal of the conviction and, eventually, the release of the killer. The appellate judges probably were right, yet nothing could more clearly illustrate the wrong-headedness of the Mallory Rule—a rule concerned with a matter of procedure and not with the question of whether justice has been done.

Judge John J. Sirica said that he ordered the release of Gross "with reluctance," and that "if the new crime bill had been in effect when this man confessed he would not be set free today."

We hope that the moaners and the groaners will give a little thought to this—especially those who say, although they must know better, that Title III revives "arrests for investigation." It does nothing of the sort. Since Mallory had nothing whatever to do with any constitutional issue, we would also like to think that we have heard the last of the contention that Title III will be held unconstitutional "in the light of the Mallory Rule." This probably is a vain hope, however, since any such claim must spring not from deliberate misrepresentation but from total ignorance.

Title III may have its imperfections and if so Congress can correct them as experience demonstrates the fact. Meanwhile, we would rather take our chances with this new law

than with a judicial rule which frees a confessed killer or a confessed rapist (Mallory) to walk the streets of this city.

From Oil City-Franklin Clarion (Pa.)
Derrick, Feb. 7, 1968]

CHARACTER OF SOCIETY

Poverty is often given as the reason for much of the violence in our cities, and government leaders recommend spending billions of tax dollars to provide jobs. This supposed connection between poverty and riots is seldom questioned, but Evangelist Billy Graham flatly rejects the claim that poverty is the cause of present civil disturbances. He points out, "there was no such rioting, looting or killing of police officers in depression days when people were much poorer."

To many, there is far more involved in the present breakdown of law and order than just the restlessness born of poverty. Respect for law lies in the character of our people rather than in their affluence. A law-abiding society is built on character, and character cannot be created or bought at will with tax dollars.

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer]

MAKING IT EASY FOR THE CRIMINAL

Recalling his experiences as head of Philadelphia's Police Department, New York's Police Commissioner Howard R. Leary remarked the other day that a survey taken in 1965 showed that 35 percent of all violent crimes in this city were committed by persons who were on parole, probation or bail, and 40 percent were committed by persons who had been convicted at least twice for previous lawless acts.

The repeaters and the individuals released prematurely on probation or parole fill the police records with crimes that could have been prevented by less lenient treatment when they were in custody.

"Why should we have to arrest the same man over and over again for rape?" asks Commissioner Leary. "The same man over and over again for robbery? Perhaps what you need is a law to remove him permanently from society."

Certainly there is need of greater preventive action to keep the habitual offenders from the streets. Stiffer sentences for all kinds of felonies is one answer. Another is less liberal resort to parole and probation to set free persons convicted of crime. Still another is speeded-up court process to bring defendants in criminal cases to trial. Time after time we hear of individuals who are free on bail getting arrested for another, and perhaps similar, crime.

Life is being made too easy for the criminal element; violation of the law is running hand in hand with contempt for all law.

[From Nation's Agriculture, February 1968]

CRIME IN THE STREETS

"At what point is the approach of danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us it must spring up amongst us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. I hope I am over-wary. But if I am not, there is even now, something of ill-omen amongst us. I mean the increasing disregard for law that pervades the country, the growing disposition to substitute the wild and furious passions in lieu of sober judgment of courts and, the worse, savage mobs for the executive ministers of justice."

These words, which could be applied to recent disorder and riots in the streets, are from a speech by Abraham Lincoln in Springfield, Illinois, on January 27, 1838. In like manner, the noted historian, Arnold

Toynbee, has observed that the fall of every civilization has been preceded by declining morality, increasing contempt for the law and growing barbarism and anarchy within the nation before being conquered by outside powers. America is today being infiltrated and threatened by barbarism and anarchy from within.

Riots, sit-ins, looting, lawlessness of every kind are increasing at an alarming rate. Recent Supreme Court decisions seem to provide greater protection for criminals than law-abiding citizens. Disrespect and disregard for certain laws is being advocated from a few pulpits and the National Council of Churches has encouraged, as well as provided financial support for, protest marches and other civil disorders. The rationale is that riots, protests and even crime are the result of the "failure of society," that individuals should not be forced to obey laws which "offend one's conscience."

This philosophy encourages immorality and lawlessness by providing easy excuses for all kinds of indolence, degradation and crime. It is argued that the individual should not be held fully responsible for his acts when he has been handicapped by a slum environment, poverty, racial discrimination or inadequate education. Abraham Lincoln would not have become a statesman if he had been influenced by such perverted reasoning.

Finding the cause for the alarming increase in the incidence of crime in America is not easy because there are so many contributing factors. Many point to the breakdown of family life—working mothers, excessive drinking, easy divorce, little or no parental discipline. Others point to government programs which ignore or premiumize immorality, such as rewarding mothers of illegitimate children with welfare payments in proportion to the number of offspring and soliciting school drop-outs for make-work jobs at handsome salaries. Some place the blame on inadequate education in the public schools or the failure of the churches to challenge and inspire the people.

Few have related civil disorders, immorality and crime to government fiscal irresponsibility and the inflation which has gripped our nation for so many years.

Inflation is caused by the federal government spending more than it takes in—fiscal irresponsibility. Inflation destroys the value of savings—thus penalizing thrift and encouraging speculation and big spending. Inflation gets its impetus from human selfishness and greed—from efforts to get something for nothing.

Socialism, materialism, inflation and immorality seem to travel together down the same road. "If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher." It is easy to place responsibility for inflation and the evils it breeds on the Great Society or politicians generally, but all citizens must share the blame. 1968 provides a great opportunity for legitimate and constitutional protest—at the polls.

CHARLES B. SHUMAN,
President, American Farm Bureau
Federation.

Kilmer Job Corps Center

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, periodically I have commented on the successful rec-

ord of the Kilmer Job Corps Center. On February 9, 1967, I noted that the Kilmer Center was soon to celebrate its second anniversary. At that time, almost 1,300 youngsters had been trained and placed in employment by the Kilmer Center. Today I am proud to bring to our attention Kilmer's third anniversary. An article in the Philadelphia Inquirer on February 12 recognized the achievement of the center in having graduated 3,217 corpsmen and placed 2,696 in jobs. I continue to be gratified by Kilmer's fine record, and I take this occasion to express my pride in the fine work accomplished by the staff and corpsmen as witnessed by this achievement.

Under unanimous consent I submit the article from the Philadelphia Inquirer in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

JOB CORPS GRADUATED 3,217

EDISON, N.J., February 11.—The Kilmer Job Corps Center here has graduated 3,217 corpsmen and placed 2,696 in jobs, officials said Sunday on the occasion of the center's third anniversary.

The first corpsmen arrived here Feb. 1, 1965. Current enrollment is about 1,700 youths between the ages of 16 and 22.

A spokesman said the center will delay its official celebration until April to coincide with the nation-wide Job Corps third anniversary planned by the U.S. Office of Economic Opportunity.

Future Farmers of America

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Future Farmers of America is celebrating its 37th anniversary this year and represents a very important influence in the rural life of Minnesota. The current national membership is 445,000 affiliated with 8,900 local chapters. The Minnesota FFA membership is 13,826 representing 276 local high school Future Farmer chapters. It gives me great pleasure to salute Future Farmers of America in Minnesota and elsewhere across the Nation during this FFA Week.

Agriculture is this Nation's largest single industry. It is basic to our continued economic and social stability. The production, processing, and distribution of agricultural products employs more than a third of America's working force; and farmers are a \$14 billion a year customer of industry and labor, not counting the billions farmers spend for consumer goods.

Our great cities, our mighty industries, our business and professional accomplishments, our educational institutions, and our high living standards are possible because of the efficiency and productivity of the American farm.

Likewise, the agricultural interests and income of farmers are inseparably tied to the health and prosperity of working men and women and the industries in

our towns and cities. No one element of our Nation can scarcely exist, and certainly not prosper, independently of the others.

This Nation must have a constant supply of new farmers every year to replace those who leave the farm. These must be men with experience and training, for the successful farmer today is both a scientist and a businessman, mechanic and a laborer—at the same time capable of leadership in the affairs of the community. Generally, they must be men who have begun farming at an early age, so that by the time they are ready to marry and start a family they will be firmly established in a farming program that promises a good future.

The number of young men on farms is more than adequate to meet the needs for replacements, but not enough of those who enter farming have the educational background that is necessary for success under modern conditions. Vocational Agriculture and the Future Farmers of America constitute the most effective program developed for training boys to be good farmers and good citizens, and helping them to become established in the agricultural occupation of their choice.

In Minnesota, our FFA chapters are not only engaged in the active training of future farmers, but also are focussing attention on occupations related to farming such as marketing, processing and other agri-business activities. Those who are unable to actively farm will find many agriculturally related opportunities.

Our Minnesota FFA boys have an enviable record of community accomplishment as well as training in agriculture. Many chapters have sponsored fairs or livestock shows, conducted community-wide safety campaigns, and home fire drills. Almost all of the chapters have conducted organized conservation programs such as reforestation, habitat improvement, raising and releasing of waterfowl and/or upland game birds. They have raised and released over 10,000 wild mallard ducks and over 30,000 pheasants, and have planted a total of 1,729,247 tree seedlings.

Garden and carpenter tools have been collected, repaired, and shipped to developing overseas countries in cooperation with the Christian rural overseas program, which is evidence of the awareness of our young Future Farmers of their responsibilities on the global scene.

In Minnesota, our boys have contributed over \$150,000 toward Camp Courage for crippled children and adults, further evidence of their desire to be good citizens as well as good farmers.

In closing, I would like my salute to the Future Farmers of America to include the words of the FFA creed, which in reality is a code for living that could be well adopted by all Americans. I hereby submit it at this point in the RECORD:

THE FFA CREED

I believe in the future of farming, with a faith born not of words, but of deeds—achievements won by the present and past

generations of farmers; in the promise of better days through better ways, even as the better things we now enjoy have come up to us from the struggles of former years.

I believe that to live and work on a good farm is pleasant as well as challenging; for I know the joys and discomforts of farm life and hold an inborn fondness for those associations which, even in hours of discouragement, I cannot deny.

I believe in leadership from ourselves and respect from others. I believe in my own ability to work efficiently and think clearly, with such knowledge and skill as I can secure, and in the ability of organized farmers to serve our own and the public interest in marketing the product of our toil. I believe we can safeguard those rights against practices and policies that are unfair.

I believe in less dependence on begging and more power in bargaining; in the life abundant and enough honest wealth to help make it so—for others as well as myself; in less need for charity and more of it when needed; in being happy myself and playing square with those whose happiness depends upon me.

I believe that rural America can and will hold true to the best traditions in our national life and that I can exert an influence in my home and community which will stand solid for my part in that inspiring task.

Mississippi Legislature Asks Release of "Pueblo" and Crew

Hon. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a concurrent resolution which has been adopted by the Mississippi Legislature which is in session in Jackson, Miss., in regard to the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its crew.

I firmly believe that this resolution represents the attitude of the people of Mississippi and a large segment of the people of our country. It is especially timely and important in light of the recent threats by the North Koreans to punish the crew of the *Pueblo*.

The United States must renew its efforts to secure the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its entire crew, or we will lose faith with its valiant crew and subject the free world to further intimidation by the Communists.

I would like to especially concur with that part of the resolution which extends its sympathy to the families of two Mississippians who are crewmembers on the ill-fated ship.

The resolution follows:

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION No. 20

Concurrent resolution urging the President and the Congress of the United States to act promptly and with necessary appropriate action to provide for the release of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and to extend sympathy to the families of two Mississippians who are crew members on the ill-fated ship.

Whereas, the U.S.S. *Pueblo*, an honorably commissioned ship of the United States Navy, while proudly flying from its mast the

cherished and revered Stars and Stripes of the United States of America, was illegally boarded and seized by a numerically superior naval force of the North Korean Government; and

Whereas, the U.S.S. *Pueblo* was sailing on the open seas and in no manner breached any of the rules of the sea nor committed any overt or threatening act to provide said seizure; and

Whereas, the honor and dignity of the United States of America has been offended, her glorious banner sullied, and the national pride and personal spirit of the valiant crew wounded and bruised; and

Whereas, two young Mississippians were among the crew of the ill-fated ship; Communications Technician Second Class Rodney H. Duke of Rankin County and Gunner's Mate First Class Dennis R. Wadley of Leake County, are illegally held by the North Korean Government;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi, the Senate concurring therein, That we urge the President and the Congress of the United States to act without delay in providing for the immediate release of the U.S.S. *Pueblo* and its entire complement to the United States, and we further urge that such action that is necessary and warranted for implementation be applied without quiver or qualm.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this Resolution be sent to each member of the Mississippi delegation in the United States Congress, and a copy sent to Mr. and Mrs. M. H. Wadley, Carthage, Mississippi, and to the Reverend and Mrs. Fred Duke, Pelahatchie, Mississippi.

Adopted by the house of representatives January 25, 1968.

JOHN R. JUNKIN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Adopted by the senate February 13, 1968.

CHARLES L. SULLIVAN,

President of the Senate.

Educational Opportunities for District of Columbia Police

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in considering the matter of educational incentives for our police force, you may also wish to consider the availability of educational facilities in the area. Many of the educational institutions in this area have had degree programs in police science for many years. American University, here in the District, offers several courses of study: A certificate in police administration, 30 semester hours; an associate degree in police administration, 60 semester hours; or a bachelor of science degree in police administration, 120 hours. The University of Maryland has developed an associate in arts degree certificate program in law enforcement, and is planning to establish a 4-year degree program. Montgomery County Junior College offers an A.A. degree in police science, and Northern Virginia Community College also has a police science department offering an associate in arts degree.

The facilities are available; we cannot

refuse to encourage the members of our Police Department to make use of them. By not doing so, we only deprive the District of Columbia of a modern, professional, and fully trained police force.

National Negro History Week in California

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD a proclamation by Gov. Ronald Reagan, of California, designating this past week, February 10-18, as "Negro History Week" in California. It is appropriate, at this time, that all of us, not only those of us from California, be reminded of the significant contributions which the Negro has made to American history and to the development of American culture.

To contributions which the Negro race has made to every aspect of our national achievement are as varied as they are impressive. The arts have been immeasurably enriched by artists like Leontyne Price, Louis Armstrong, and Andre Watts, to name but three.

The sciences have profited from the services of men like Dr. Percy L. Julian, one of America's most distinguished research chemists. His discoveries in connection with the synthetic manufacture of certain important drugs have won him international fame.

The reputation of the American sports community depends greatly upon American athletes—men like Willie Mays, Archie Moore, and Charlie Taylor. Negroes have, in the last two decades, contributed, with increasing influence, to the political life of America. Thurgood Marshall, Robert C. Weaver, Ralph Bunche—these are names familiar to every household, and they belong to men who have significantly shaped the society we live in today.

Negroes have played a most important part in the formation of the State of California. The first Jesuit missionaries endeavoring to settle in California, in the middle 18th century, were assisted in their efforts by Negro soldiers who preserved their lives against Indian attacks. The first burial in a Christian cemetery at Monterey, in 1771, was that of a Negro, who had served the cause of the Jesuits. The historian, H. H. Bancroft, in speaking of the founding of Los Angeles, declares that the original settlement was founded September 4, 1781, by a body of 12 settlers and their families—46 persons in all, several of whom were Negroes.

Just as the Negro defended the early settlers of California, he has fought valiantly for the cause of freedom in every major conflict from the Civil War to the Vietnam war. I, personally, would like to pay special tribute to the many Negroes who are defending our national honor in Vietnam and elsewhere around

the world; and to the many here at home who are working to promote racial harmony and national unity. They are truly the unsung heroes of our time—and I hope historians will not overlook them in recording the turbulent events of the 20th century.

At this point, I take pride in presenting Governor Reagan's proclamation, and commend it to the attention of everyone who sincerely desires the progress of both the Negro race and the American Republic.

Text of the proclamation follows:

Whereas Citizens throughout California will be observing the period of February 10th to 18th as the 53rd annual National Negro History Week, sponsored by the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History; and

Whereas This period will be a fitting time for all Californians to contemplate the significant contributions which Negro citizens have made in science, industry, government, and the professions to the enrichment and advancement of our multi-racial culture; and

Whereas The Authors' Study Club, the Los Angeles branch of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, is sponsoring appropriate observances in California;

Now therefore, I, Ronald Reagan, Governor of California, do hereby proclaim the period of February 10th to 18th "Negro History Week" in California and urge that all Californians take advantage of this opportunity to learn of the roles and contributions of the American Negro in the development of the United States and the State of California.

National Future Farmers Week

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, as many of us here are aware, this is National Future Farmers Week. And it is a rather special week this year—marking as it does the 40th anniversary of the founding of the Future Farmers of America.

"Challenging Youth In Agriculture" is the theme for this year's observance. How fitting a theme it is. Upon the shoulders of these young men rests our future agronomy. They deserve our commendation, for I am sure their belief in the future of farming is sorely tried these days. Agriculture is a difficult and demanding and complex field—and this Nation is dependent upon it. But prices paid for their products are low, the cost of every facet of farming operations is up, and draft calls hit rural areas particularly hard since a great many of these young men are already the mainstay of their families' farms. Nevertheless, they continue to learn the agribusiness, and are accepting the responsibilities given them by our Nation.

The FFA has played and continues to play a vital part in the development of this Nation's agriculture and in imbuing the youthful membership with that wonderful spirit of dedication and determination which will be the backbone of our Nation in years to come. Disre-

garding all else that our agriconomy embraces, the most basic fact still stands: a nation must be fed. Without agricultural soundness and stability, we could never achieve any sort of national soundness or stability.

And so we are privileged to pay tribute to the Future Farmers of America for accepting this tremendous challenge—to all these young men to the thanks of this Nation, for they are, indeed, America's future.

George Washington's Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today Americans from coast to coast join in celebrating the 236th anniversary of the birth of George Washington.

I am indebted to Mrs. Russell Lowe, the mother of Mrs. Jane Peigler of my congressional staff, for having uncovered in her family archives a verbatim transcript of "The Rules of Civility and Decent Behaviour in Company and Conversation," by George Washington.

I share this document with my colleagues, by inserting it in the RECORD, as a warm tribute to our first President:

GEORGE WASHINGTON'S RULES OF CIVILITY AND DECENT BEHAVIOUR IN COMPANY AND CONVERSATION

From a paper found among the early writings of George Washington copied from the original with literal exactness and edited with notes by J. M. Toner, M.D., in 1888.

The text following is an exact copy from the original manuscript, having been carefully compared with the corrected therefrom, even when errors or omissions are obvious.

This book has been gnawed by mice. Rule 12 and all at bottom of any of the pages had been nearly destroyed. Every word and letter remaining has been copied and are here given:

"1. Every Action done in Company, ought to be with Some Sign of Respect, to those that are present.

"2. When in Company, put not your Hands to any Part of the Body, not usually Discovered.

"3. Shew Nothing to your Friend that may affright him.

"4. In the Presence of Others sing not to yourself with a humming Noise, nor Drum, with your Fingers or Feet.

"5. If you Cough, Sneeze, Sigh, or Yawn, do it not Loud, but Privately; and Speak not in your Yawning, but put Your handkerchief or Hand before your face and turn aside.

"6. Sleep not when others Speak, Sit not when others stand, Speak not when you Should hold your Peace, walk not on when others Stop.

"7. Put not off your Cloths in the presence of Others, nor go out your Chamber half Drest.

"8. At play and at Fire its Good manners to give Place to the last comer, and affect not to Speak Louder than ordinary.

"9. Spit not in the Fire, nor Stoop low before it neither Put your Hands into the Flames to warm them, nor Set your Feet upon the Fire especially if there be meat before it.

"10. When you Sit down, Keep your Feet firm and Even, without putting one on the other or Crossing them.

"11. Shift not your self in the Sight of others nor Gnaw on your nails.

"12. Shake not the head, Feet, or Legs, rowl not the Eys, lift not one eyebrow higher than the other, wry not the mouth, and bedew no mans face with your Spittle, by appr * * * r him * * * you Speak.

"13. Kill no Vermin as Fleas, lice ticks &c in the Sight of Others, if you See any filth or thick Spittle put your foot Dexteriously upon it, if it be upon the Cloths of your Companions, Put it off privately, and if it be upon your own Cloths return Thanks to him who puts it off.

"14. Turn not your Back to others especially in Speaking, Jog not the Table or Desk on which Another reads or writes, lean not upon any one.

"15. Keep your Nails clean and Short, also your Hands and Teeth Clean, yet without Shewing any great Concern for them.

"16. Do not Puff up the Cheeks, Loll not out the tongue rub the Hands, or beard, thrust out the lips, or bite them or keep the Lips too open or too Close.

"17. Be no Flatterer, neither Play with any that delights not to be Play'd Withal.

"18. Read no Letters, Books, or Papers in Company but when there is a Necessity for the doing of it you must ask leave: come not near the Books or Writings of Another so as to read them unless desired or give your opinion of them unask'd also look not nigh when another is writing a Letter.

"19. Let your Countenance be pleasant but in Serious Matters Somewhat grave

"20. The Gestures of the Body must be Suited to the discourse you are upon

"21. Reproach none for the Infirmities of Nature, nor Delight to Put them that have in mind thereof.

"22. Shew not yourself glad at the Misfortune of another though he were your enemy.

"23. When you see a Crime punished, you may be inwardly Pleased; but always shew Pity to the Suffering Offender.

" * * * too much at any publick * * *

"25. Superfluous Complements and all Affectation of Ceremonie are to be avoided yet where due they are not to be Neglected.

"26. In pulling off your Hat to Persons of Distinction, as Noblemen, Justices, Churchmen &c make a Reverence, bowing more or less according to the Custom of the Better Bred, and Quality of the Persons Amongst your equals expect not always that they Should begin with you first, but to Pull off the Hat when there is no need is Affectation, in the Manner of Saluting and resaluting in words keep the most usual Custom.

"27. Tis ill manners to bid one more eminent than yourself be covered as well as not to do it to whom it's due Likewise he that makes to much haste to Put on his hat does not well, yet he ought to Put it on at the first, or at most the Second time of being ask'd; now what is herein Spoken, of Qualification in behaviour in Saluting, ought also to be observed in taking of Place, and Sitting down for ceremonies without Bounds is troublesome.

"28. If any one comes to Speak to you while you are Sitting Stand up tho he be your Inferiour, and when you Present Seats let it be to every one according to his Degree.

"29. When you meet with one of Greater Quality than yourself, Stop, and retire especially if it be at a Door or any Straight place to give way for him to Pass.

"30. In walking the highest Place in most Countrys Seems to be on the right hand

therefore Place yourself on the left of him whom you desire to Honour; but if three walk together the middle Place is the most Honourable the wall is usually given to the most worthy if two walk together.

"31. If any one far Surpasses others, either in age, Estate, or Merit, * * * would give Place to a meaner than himself * * * the one ought not to except it. So * * * it above once or twice.

"32. To one that is your equal, or not much inferior you are to give the chief Place in your Lodging and he to who 'tis offered ought at the first to refuse it but at the Second to accept though not without acknowledging his own unworthiness.

"33. They that are in Dignity or in office have in all places Precedency but whilst they are Young they ought to respect those that are their equals in Birth or other Qualities, though they have no Publick charge.

"34. It is good Manners to prefer them to whom we speak before ourselves especially if they be above us with whom in no Sort we ought to begin.

"35. Let your Discourse with Men of Business be Short and Comprehensive.

"36. Artificers & Persons of low Degree ought not to use many ceremonies to Lords, or Others of high Degree but Respect and highly Honour them, and those of high Degree ought to treat them with affability & Courtesie, without Arrogancy.

"37. In Speaking to men of Quality do not lean nor Look them full in the Face, nor approach too near them at lest Keep a full Pace from them.

"38. In visiting the Sick, do not Presently play the Physician if you be not Knowing therein.

"39. In writing or Speaking, give to every Person his due Title According to his Degree & the Custom of the Place.

"40. Strive not with your Superiors in argument, but always Submit your Judgment to others with Modesty.

"41. Undertake not to Teach your equal in the art himself Professes; it flavours of arrogance.

"42. * * * courtesie be proper to the * * * Dignity of his place * * * t yr. same with a * * * Clown and a Prince.

"43. Do not express Joy before one sick or in pain for that contrary Passion will aggravate his Misery.

"44. When a man does all he can though it Succeeds not well blame not him that did it.

"45. Being to advise or reprehend any one consider whether it ought to be in Publick or in Private; presently, or at Some other time in what terms to do it & in reproving Shew no Sign of Cholar but do it with all Sweetness and Mildness.

"46. Take all Admonitions thankfully in what Time or Place Soever given but afterwards not being culpable take a Time or Place Convenient to let him know it that gave them.

"47. Mock not nor Jest at anything of importance break no Jest that are Sharp Biting and if you Deliver anything witty and Pleasant abstain from Laughing there at yourself.

"48. Wherein Wherein you reprove Another be unblameable yourself; for example is more prevalent than Precepts.

"49. Use no Reproachfull Language against any one neither Curse nor Revile.

"50. Be not hasty to believe flying Reports to the Disparagement of any.

"51. Wear not your Cloths foul, unript or Dusty but See they be Brush'd once every day at least and take heed that you approach not to any Uncleaness.

"52. In your Apparel be Modest and endeavour to accommodate Nature, rather than to procure Admiration keep to the Fashion of your equals, Such as are Civil and orderly with respect to Times and Places.

"53. Run not in the Streets, neither go too slowly nor with Mouth open go not Shaking Yr. Arms * * * not upon the toes, nor in a Dancing * * *

"54. Play not the Peacock, looking everywhere about you, to See if you be well Deck'd, if your Shoes fit well if your Stockings Sit neatly, and Cloths handsomely.

"55. Eat not in the Street, nor in ye House, out of Season.

"56. Associate yourself with Men of good Quality if you Esteem your own Reputation; for 'tis better to be alone than in bad Company.

"57. In walking up and Down in a House, only with One in Company, if he be Greater than yourself, at the first give him the Right hand and Stop not till he does and be not the first that turns, and when you do turn let it be with your face towards him if he be a Man of Great Quality, walk not with him Cheek by Jowl but Somewhat behind him; but yet in Such a Manner that he may easily Speak to you.

"58. Let your Conversation be without Malice or Envy, for 'tis a Sign of a Tractable and Commendable Nature, & in all Causes of Passion admit Reason to Govern.

"59. Never express anything unbecoming, nor Act Ag'tt ye Rules of Moral before your inferiours.

"60. Be not immodest in urging your Friends to Discover a Secret.

"61. Utter not base and frivolous things amongst grave and Learn'd Men nor very Difficult Questions or Subjects, amongst the Ignorant or things hard to be believed, Stuff not your Discourse with Sentences amongst your Betters nor Equals.

"62. Speak not of doleful Things in a Time of Mirth or at the Table; Speak not of Melancholy Things a Death and Wounds, and if others Mention them Change if you can the Discourse tell not your Dreams, but to your intimate Friend.

"63. A man ought not to value himself of his Achievements or rare Qual * * * lost Virtue or Kindred * * *

"64. Break not a Jest where none take pleasure in mirth Laugh not aloud, nor at all without Occasion, deride no man's Misfortune, tho' there seem to be Some cause.

"65. Speak not injurious Words neither in Jest nor Earnest Scoff at none although they give Occasion.

"66. Be not forward but friendly and Courteous; the first to Salute hear and answer & be not Pensive when It's a time to converse.

"67. Detract not from others neither be excessive in Commanding.

"68. Go not thither, where you know not, whether you Shall be Welcome or not. Give not Advice whth being Ask'd & when desired do it briefly.

"69. If two contend together take not the part of either unconstrained and be not obstinate in your Opinion, in Things indifferent be of the Major side.

"70. Reprehend not the Imperfections of others for that belongs to Parents Masters and Superiours.

"71. Gaze not on the marks or blemishes of Others and ask not how they came. What you may Speak in Secret to your Friend deliver not before others.

"72. Speak not in an unknown Tongue in Company but in your own Language and that as those of Quality do and not as ye Vulgar; Sublime matters treat Seriously.

"73. Think before your Speak pronounce not imperfectly nor bring out your Words too hastily but orderly and Distinctly.

"74. When Another Speaks be attentive your Self and disturb not the Audience if any hesitate in his Words help him not nor Prompt him without desired, Interrupt him

not, nor Answer him till his Speech be ended.

"75. In the midst of Discourse ask * * * but if you Perceive any Stop because of * * * to Proceed: If a Person of Quality comes in while your Conversing its hand-comes to Repeat what was said before.

"76. While you are talking, Point not with your Finger at him of Whom you Discourse nor Approach too near him to whom you talk especially to his face.

"77. Treat with men at fit Times about Business & Whisper not in the Company of Others.

"78. Make no Comparisons and if any of the Company be Commended for any brave act of Virtue, commend not another for the Same.

"79. Be not apt to relate News, if you know not the truth thereof. In Discoursing of things you Have hear Name not your Author always A Secret Discover not.

"80. Be not Tediuous in Discourse or in reading unless you find the Company pleased therewith.

"81. Be not Curious to Know the Affairs of Others neither approach to those that Speak in Private

"82. Undertake not what you cannot Perform but be Careful to keep your Promise

"83. When you deliver a matter do it without Passion & with Discretion, however mean ye Person be you do it too

"84. When your Superiors talk to any Body hearken not neither Speak nor Laugh

"85. In Company of these Higher Quality than yourself Speak not till you are ask'd a Question then Stand upright put of your Hat & Answer in few words.

"86. In Disputes, be not so Desirous to Overcome as not to give Liberty to each one to deliver his Opinion and Submit to ye Judgment of ye Major Part especially if they are Judges of the Dispute.

"87. * * * as becomes a Man Grave * * * Settled and attentive * * * dict not at every turn what others Say.

"88. Be not tediuous in Discourse, make not many Digressions, nor repeat often the Same manner of Discourse.

"89. Speak not Evil of the absent for it is unjust.

"90. Being Set at meat Scratch not neither Spit Cough or blow your Nose except there's a Necessity for it.

"91. Make no Shew of taking great Delight in your Victuals, Feed not With Greediness; cut your Bread with a Knife, lean not on the Table neither find fault with what you Eat.

"92. Take no Salt or cut Bread with your Knife Greasy.

"93. Entertaining any one at table it is decent to present him wt meat. Undertake not to help others undesired by ye Master.

"94. If you Soak bread in the Sauce let it be no more than what you put in your Mouth at a time and blow not your broth at Table but Stay till Cools of it Self.

"95. Put not your meat to your Mouth with your Knife in your hand neither Spit forth the Stones of any fruit Pye upon a Dish nor cast anything under the table.

"96. It's unbecoming to Stoop much to ones Meat. Keep your Fingers clean & when foul wipe them on a Corner of your Table Napkin.

"97. Put not another bit into your Mouth till the former be Swallowed let not your Morsels be too big for the jowls.

"98. Drink not nor talk with your mouth full neither Gaze about you while you are a Drinking.

"99. Drink not too leisurely nor yet too hastily. Before and after Drinking wipe your Lips breath not then or Ever with too Great a Noise, for its uncivil.

"100. Cleanse not your teeth with the Table Cloth Napkin Fork or Knife but if Others do it let it be done wt a Pick Tooth

"101. Rince not your Mouth in the Presence of Others

"102. It is out of use to call upon the Company often to Eat nor need you Drink to others every Time you Drink.

"103. In Company of your Betters be not * * * than they are lay not your Arm but ar.

"104. It belongs to ye Chiefest in Company to unfold his Napkin and fall to Meat first, But he ought then to Begin in time and to Dispatch with Dexterity that ye Slowest may have time allowed him.

"105. Be not Angry at Table whatever happens & if you have reason to be so, Shew it not but on a Cheerfull Countenance especially if there be Strangers for good Humour make one Dish of Meat a Feast.

"106. Set not yourself at ye upper * * * of ye Table but if it be your Due or that ye Master of ye house will have it so, Contend not lest you Should Trouble ye company.

"107. If others talk at Table be attentive but talk not with Meat in your Mouth

"108. When you Speak of God or his Attributes, let it be Seriously & * * * Reverence. Honor & obey your Natural Parents altho they be Poor

"109. Let your Recreation be Manfull not Sinfull.

"110. Labour to keep alive in your Breast the Little Spark of Celestial fire called Conscience."

Elect A. B. J.

HON. DONALD J. IRWIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, in the current emotionally trying times that force many emotionally determined choices, I was pleased to see the following realistic appraisal of the forthcoming presidential race. Last Sunday the editors of the New York Times focused their hard realistic eye on some of the factors that will contribute to the race.

I found it refreshing to find the Times "back on the track." The New York Times editorial follows:

ELECT A. B. J.

As this election year begins, a button has made its appearance reading in large letters: "Elect ABJ." In much smaller print, ABJ turns out to be "Anyone But Johnson." There is no question that this set of initials expresses the attitude of a growing number of people. Mr. Johnson has lost the confidence and respect of many voters and even among the larger number of people who agree with some or all of his policies, he evokes comparatively little affection or admiration.

Those who feel most strongly against Mr. Johnson argue that only a new man in the White House could lead the nation out of the Vietnam impasse. Any Republican, it is contended, could make peace more easily than the incumbent who inescapably has an emotional commitment to present policies.

This is a powerful argument and, in our view, the most telling argument against President Johnson's re-election. But to make peace a man has to want to do so, be willing to pay the price for a settlement, and know how to negotiate it. These criteria apply as well to the Republican aspirants as they do to Mr. Johnson. Can it be said that Mr. Nixon, now the leading Republican candidate, is less bellicose, more willing to sacrifice a political advantage, and more calm and skill-

ful in negotiation than Mr. Johnson? And if not Mr. Nixon, how about Governor Reagan?

Clearly, just any Republican cannot be counted upon to hasten the prospects for peace in Vietnam. Those who speak of "any" Republican are actually making one of two major qualifications. The first is to dismiss the Nixon-Reagan statements on the war as so much "campaign rhetoric." Governor Reagan has been in public life too short a time for one to form a judgment about the consistency of his views, but in Mr. Nixon's case, we see no reason to question the coherence and authenticity of his opinions on foreign policy. His tactical cleverness and verbal dexterity in domestic politics notwithstanding, he has for more than fifteen years taken a reasonably consistent "hard" line in foreign affairs. Those who think that Mr. Nixon does not believe what he says about a stronger military effort in Vietnam are standing on shaky ground.

The other tacit qualification made by those who favor "any" alternative to Mr. Johnson is that the alternative is going to be Governor Rockefeller or Governor Romney or Senator Percy. But Mr. Rockefeller's current views on Vietnam are unknown and Messrs. Romney and Percy are singularly lacking in experience in foreign affairs. Neither of them has the stature that General Eisenhower possessed in 1952 when ending the Korean War was the dominant election issue. The ambiguities and uncertainties of their possible candidacies point up the underlying truth that politics is a matter of choice, and rational choice requires that alternatives be clearly visible.

If President Johnson's record were hopelessly negative, it might still be possible to sport an ABJ button. But, in fact, his domestic record in education, health, and civil rights has many strengths. In foreign affairs, he has labored patiently for disarmament, for *detente* with Russia, and for freer trade. Even in Vietnam, where he made a grave miscalculation in committing American power on unfavorable terrain for an unattainable objective, Mr. Johnson has resisted the superhawks who want to blockade Haiphong and level Hanoi. And as his careful management of the Pueblo affair makes clear, the President seems at last to have been impressed by one of the most important and most painful lessons to be learned from Vietnam: America's reach should not exceed its grasp.

It is a democratic fallacy, encouraged by the fake intimacy of television, that heads of state have to be lovable or even likable. In the nuclear age, a President has to be rated on his competence, not his charm. It is up to the Republicans to produce a convincing alternative to LBJ, and a gross error for them to rely for victory on his present chief rival, ABJ.

Dr. Culbreth B. Cook: His Aim Is First-Class Jobs

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, with the great emphasis we place on professors in our modern universities, we often overlook the splendid work being performed by administrators and guidance personnel. Dr. Culbreth B. Cook, director of student placement and financial aid for Cuyahoga Community College in Cleveland, is a wonderful example of what

an understanding and perceptive administrator can do to aid young students in adjusting to our rapidly changing society. Mr. Speaker, at this point I insert in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Cleveland Press on February 20:

HIS AIM IS FIRST-CLASS JOBS

(By Bob Seltzer)

Job placement is the first love of Dr. Culbreth B. Cook, and he finds the greatest demand of employers is for students in mechanical, electronic and building construction technology.

Dr. Cook, director of student placement and financial aid for the Metropolitan Campus of Cuyahoga Community College, said these students earn associates in science degrees. Starting salaries are from \$500 to \$600 a month.

"Big corporations put in bids several months in advance for our June graduates," said Dr. Cook. "Second in demand for men is accountants. For women, demand is highest for those completing the two-year courses for registered nurses, dental hygienist and secretarial science. Third is data processing."

"There are not enough Negro students in these fields. Their families and counselors are steeped in the old stereotype of preparing them for medicine, the law, teaching, social work, dentistry and the ministry. The sooner they aim for occupations in demand, the closer and quicker Negro students will get to first-class citizenship in all areas."

Dr. Cook, who graduated from Shaw High School, earned his M.A. and Ed. D. degrees from Western Reserve University and took post-doctoral work at Harvard and John Carroll University, is co-director of a workshop at Case WRU with Dr. Anne Pruitt, assistant professor of guidance and counseling.

The workshop, "Employment Problems of Negro High School Graduates," will hold its fourth annual three-week course in late June and early July. It is made up of teams of three from high schools and junior high schools—a teacher, a counselor and an administrator.

"We find that these graduates are ill-equipped in communication skills: reading, writing and arithmetic," Dr. Cook said. "I am a strong advocate of returning to the intensive teaching of the three R's at all levels."

Dr. Cook, a native of Cincinnati, coordinates campus and outside student employment for CCC and heads the college's aid program of scholarships, grants-in-aid and loans. This aid is based on need and scholarship achievement.

Before joining CCC in 1964 as vocational counselor, he was placement director for John Hay High School. For 25 years he taught in Cleveland junior and senior high schools. Dr. Cook, 56, zestful and dedicated, said his placement post and wide acquaintance in industry afford his best area for race relations.

"My concern is to put Negroes in places where they never have been before—'Pilot placement,' the Urban League calls it. I always stress the point of equal opportunity—not preferred treatment. All the Negro asks is the opportunity to achieve equality in employment, education and housing."

Dr. Cook enlisted in the Navy in 1943 and helped build and administer the Navy's first school for illiterates at the Great Lakes (Ill.) Naval Training Station. Later, he taught adult illiterates for the Cleveland School Board's adult education department.

The educator's wife, Katherine, holds an M.A. in group social work from WRU. She was the first Negro Girl Scout executive in the Cleveland area. The Cooks' daughter, Julie, is a junior at Western College for Women, Oxford, O. The Cooks live at 1568 E. 108th St.

With GOP It Is Nixon by 2 to 1

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Miami Herald of February 19, 1968:

WITH GOP IT IS NIXON BY 2 TO 1—ROCKY SECOND, ROMNEY BEHIND REAGAN

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—Richard Nixon has widened his already commanding lead over seven other GOP contenders as the choice of Republican voters for the 1968 presidential nomination.

The former vice president is the favorite of 51 per cent of rank-and-file Republicans in the latest survey and now leads his closest rival, Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, by 26 percentage points.

Rockefeller's standing has shown little change since the previous survey, in early January, while Nixon has gained 9 percentage points.

Rockefeller surged in popularity with Republican voters between November and January when he nearly doubled his share of the vote from 15 per cent to 27 per cent.

Nixon has led the field in all but one of the 23 tests of GOP candidate strength conducted since the 1964 presidential election.

The exception came in November 1966, when the newly reelected Gov. George Romney of Michigan briefly moved into the lead.

Romney, the only other announced candidate on the list, continues to lose favor with Republicans. Firmly in second place before his "brainwash" statement in early September (with 24 per cent of the vote to Nixon's 35 per cent), Romney now has only 7 per cent of the vote and is in fourth place behind Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

Interviewing for the current survey was completed Feb. 7, immediately following Nixon's announcement of his candidacy and just prior to the clash between Mayor John Lindsay of New York City and Gov. Rockefeller over the recent sanitation strike in that city.

It should be carefully noted that the results in today's report are based on a national sample of Republicans and cannot be applied to any one region or state.

Nixon has also registered gains with Independents.

Rockefeller in January has drawn even with Nixon but the latter has now moved into a 34 to 26 per cent lead among Independents.

The choices of Independents are important since numerically they represent a voting group as large as Republicans. In order to do well in a presidential election, a Republican nominee must make a good showing with this group.

Bill Harrison Offers Wyoming Seniority, Experience, and Accomplishments

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, BILL HARRISON, offers Wyoming seniority,

experience, and accomplishments in his announcement for a sixth term as the State's sole Representative in this body, and I am pleased to note that the newspapers of Wyoming have responded warmly to his announcement.

All of us who work with BILL HARRISON hope and expect that the voters of Wyoming will respond in the same fashion. Certainly there is no substitute for the ability, the energy, the devotion to duty and the experience that make him an outstanding Member of Congress.

I wish to include with these remarks editorial comments from the Cheyenne State Tribune, the Sheridan Press, the Casper Star-Tribune, and the Torrington Telegram, as well as a copy of Mr. HARRISON's announcement that he will seek a sixth term:

[From the Cheyenne (Wyo.) State Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

HARRISON DECLARES

The most notable thing about William Henry Harrison's announcement for re-election to Congress is that it came as early as it did. Most politicians or aspiring office-seekers usually play it coy, waiting until a time closer to the filing deadline before formally making their intentions known even though only men, women and children are aware of their intentions.

By his early declaration, the durable Bill Harrison has served notice to one and all, both within and without his own party, there should be no doubt as to his plans and that all prospective primary and general election opponents must take notice thereof.

These latter might very well study past political history as well as the trend of the times, particularly the last two elections in this state.

When Harrison lost his only House race, in 1964, to Teno Roncalio, he went down by a mere 2,211 votes in an election that produced one of the biggest Democratic landslides in both state and nation, in the preceding eight years. Lyndon Johnson carried that election in Wyoming by 18,187 votes, the biggest popular majority accorded any Presidential candidate since Eisenhower (Nixon's margin over Kennedy in 1960 was 14,120).

Harrison, thus, was not overwhelmed in 1964 by any means; and he proved his ability to bounce back from that loss by immediately commencing his campaign for another term which he successfully carried out nearly two years later.

While age has been made a factor by his opponents in almost every race Bill Harrison has run in the past half dozen years, he has shot this theory to shreds by bouncing around like a 20-year-old.

Much was made of the fact in the 1966 election that while Harrison had been on the House Appropriations Committee before his 1964 defeat, and that Harrison suggested that if elected he would get his old seat back on that 50-member panel whose influence is so far-reaching.

Bill Harrison confounded these seers who said it couldn't be done by not only getting back on the appropriations committee but also by getting a ranking on it considerably above first-termers (17th out of 21 Republican members).

It might be well to point out at this juncture that Harrison suffered only one other political defeat in a general election contest since he first was elected to the U.S. House of Representatives in 1950.

That loss came in 1954, when he chose the late Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney for the U.S. Senate. Despite O'Mahoney's enormous pres-

tige and his strong political image, he won this contest—an off-year affair between the two monumental Eisenhower victories, only by 57,845 to 54,407, an edge of 3,438 votes.

It may well be that others will choose Harrison, if not within his own party, then certainly without. And it is probable that lacking anything else to contend against him with, they very well will harp on the age issue. Harrison will be 72 next August but if he recognizes this, he acts more like he thinks the figures were reversed.

He will be well-nigh unbeatable in the primary, and with all signs pointing to this as an obvious Republican year with no outside moral support from a Lyndon Johnson whose own record could well sink the most doughty Democratic candidates, Harrison very well could be unbeatable in the general election too. But apparently to make sure no one mistakes his intentions, he has made them clear, very early.

Anyone who chooses him can expect to have his work cut out for him. History supports that theory, and present conditions lend strength to history.

[From the Sheridan (Wyo.) Press, Feb. 13, 1968]

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Dick Redburn)

It was late at night, and the 1949 Wyoming legislature had or was near adjournment. In a room off the legislative chambers in the Capitol building in Cheyenne several people were talking and relaxing.

Among them were Lewis Bates, then editor and editorial writer for the Wyoming State Tribune; myself, then a reporter for the Tribune; and Bill Harrison, who was completing a third term in the Wyoming House of Representatives. There were others in the room but the faces and names are now hazy.

Bates, who by then had covered many Wyoming legislatures and had a shrewd sense of what many of these men thought, asked Harrison what his plans were.

"I think I'll try for Congress," Bill Harrison said.

Unofficial and informal, this was nevertheless the first time Harrison announced he would enter higher level politics.

Bill Harrison did what he said.

I remained on the reportorial staff of the Tribune for a time longer, and was to see Bill Harrison again. One noon coming out of the Tribune office, we nearly collided, but Harrison, then in the Republican primary seeking his first term in Congress, was undisturbed. He whipped out a campaign card and proceeded on his rounds meeting more people, handing out more cards.

Harrison was elected to Congress.

Off and on over the next few years paths would cross again. They became like paths when Ike Eisenhower ran for his first term as president. By that time, this reporter had become a member of the staff of Gov. Frank A. Barrett, and in that election Barrett was taking on the then Democratic political camp of the late Sen. Joseph C. O'Mahoney. Election of state officials was also up that year, and the Republicans consolidated travel, and campaign schedules.

Becoming involved in that campaign as a Barrett aid, meant becoming involved in the campaigns of the others. It should be recorded that in that campaign the main focus was on Barrett's race against O'Mahoney, while Harrison had the easier race.

But Bill Harrison considers no race easy. I think that at times Harrison felt his race was being underplayed, and at times I think he felt edgy about it.

It was also then, I discovered what a Bill Harrison campaign meant—it meant pounding the pavement in every town and hamlet

in the state—it meant going into rural areas where the farmers and ranchers were at work—it meant long nights planning the next day or the next several days—it meant long nights planning speeches, and planning new advertising to meet the competition.

Harrison, Barrett and all the rest of the Republicans swept in with Eisenhower, and with feet sufficiently soaked in the political waters, I moved to Sheridan and returned to the newspaper business.

But shedding political experiences is not like shedding the measles. Politics may rub off, but never completely, so this acquaintance with Bill Harrison has continued, as have others.

Just as Bill Harrison put in exhaustive hours in the Wyoming legislature, so has he put in exhaustive hours in Washington. It has also been nice to have a personal friend in Washington. We certainly are not alone when we say that having a Sheridan country or a northeast Wyoming resident in Washington is a valuable state of affairs. When local problems need attention on a national level, there is someone there with a sense of understanding and a sense of empathy to the problem because it involves the place he calls home.

Bill Harrison has been this kind of a servant to the county and area, even as he represented the whole of Wyoming and the nation.

It would be flourishing the trumpets too loudly to say we've always agreed with him, or that we've always found him right. We lay no claim to political Godship for Harrison. But claim can be laid to experience.

Experience in the ways of getting things done in Washington.

Experience in dealing with national problems.

Experience in dealing with the interests of Wyoming.

More experience in dealing with the interests of this area when attention on the national level was necessary.

It was last Friday that I saw Bill Harrison again. He was standing in the lobby of the Bank of Commerce, awaiting the elevator, and on the way to his upstairs office.

We talked, he about the important things going on in Washington, and I about politics.

He would run again for Congress, he said.

And I thought—we are back where we started in 1949. But we weren't. There are 19 years in between—19 years most of which had been given in the service of the public at home, in the state, and in the nation.

Carrying his brief case, Harrison caught the elevator and headed for his office. In Washington or at home, there is work to be done.

[From the Casper (Wyo.) Star-Tribune, Feb. 13, 1968]

HARRISON ANNOUNCES

Rep. William Henry Harrison's decision to run for reelection was not particularly surprising. The timing, however, was considerably in advance of general expectations.

Since he had made up his mind this early, Rep. Harrison did the fair thing by the party in making it known, so that other prospective candidates could reach a decision based on the facts rather than on speculation.

Despite his age, Harrison is known as an extremely capable campaigner, and he can be expected to acquit himself well. His reputation in this field will not necessarily discourage others from entering the lists, and it should be a healthful circumstance if there is a clearly-drawn primary contest.

The Republican Party has ample room for divergent approaches to the problems facing the country, and competition does not imply repudiation. The voters are entitled to have

the opportunity for choice in the primary as well as in the general election.

[From the Torrington (Wyo.) Telegram,
Feb. 15, 1968]

STATE, NATION NEED HARRISON

News that Bill Harrison would be a candidate for re-election to Congress came as a surprise to few people in the State of Wyoming. It should be good news, however, that he made it official.

Bill Harrison has served his state and his nation well. His political philosophies are particularly vital at this stage of the nation's involvement in world affairs, as well as at home.

Harrison's detractors from the other side of the political aisle have, and will in the future, make his age a factor in the campaign. It should be pointed out the Johnson Administration made the most noise about job discrimination because of age. It seems to us that if ever maturity and the wisdom that comes with age were required it is now! Putting it another way, the Democratic party powers-that-be have given just one more reason why Bill Harrison should be re-elected!

POLITICAL PLANS FOR 1968

(Statement of Congressman WILLIAM HENRY HARRISON, at a press conference in Casper, Wyo., February 12, 1968)

I have come home to Wyoming to announce publicly to the party and people who have supported me in my ten years in Congress that I intend to wage a vigorous and successful campaign for a sixth term in the United States House of Representatives.

The anniversary of the birth of the President who created the Republican party seems a particularly appropriate moment for my announcement, for it is my party which must first pass upon my credentials for another term.

It is to my party that I submit my record without hesitation and assert that what I have accomplished for Wyoming, what I am in the process of accomplishing, and what I intend for the future qualify me for the nomination and for the seat that I have held during the 82nd, 83rd, 87th, 88th and 90th Congresses.

The only measure of personal pride that I claim is in my affection for the State of Wyoming and her people. I am proud to be a Wyomingite, to have served this State and her people in three consecutive terms in the State Legislature and in five terms in the United States Congress.

I have watched Wyoming mature from an essentially single industry state of the 1930's to the diversified home of 340-thousand Americans which is Wyoming in the 1960's. I believe I can say that to no small extent I have been a part of that growth.

During my ten years in the Congress, I have introduced and worked for more than 150 bills and resolutions that sought the direct betterment of Wyoming. In those years, 24 Harrison bills and resolutions have passed the House and most of these become public laws. The average for Congressmen is two bills in a full two-session Congress.

I have supported, and will continue to support, the varied interests of my State; from our ranching and manufacturing, to tourism and minerals extraction. I will continue working for a broader economic base for Wyoming and for those Federal laws and attitudes vital to the goals we seek for our State. Wyoming needs a greater realization of her industrial potential; more jobs, and paychecks, not only to keep our sons and daughters in Wyoming working to the mutual benefit of themselves and our State, but to bring into Wyoming the new blood and creative talent which will benefit us mightily.

The press said of me editorially when I ran

with Milward Simpson and Cliff Hansen in 1962, that my "interests have ranged from agriculture, to reclamation, to oil royalties. They have cut across the economic spectrum that is Wyoming." I might add that seniority in the House of Representatives has broadened those interests and given me new insights relating to them. This service has brought with it age, which I have never sought to conceal.

The people of my party and State know my record and my energies and they know that the other side of the coin of age is the side marked "experience and seniority." This is the truly important factor to State and Nation.

In an eloquent statement issued last month, Senator Harrison A. Williams of New Jersey—a liberal Democrat, I might add—called the use of age as a test for responsibility and work, "a misconception that should have been thoroughly discredited." Senator Williams, himself a young man, added that "experience is a precious commodity."

In my ten years in Congress I have missed not a single day of work because of illness—not even from a common cold—and my doctors assure me that I am in excellent health and fully capable of waging the kind of vigorous campaign that Wyoming deserves and will get from me.

And that brings me to another point which I feel in all honesty must be brought into the open to settle once and for all an unfounded rumor.

I say publicly for the record, that at no time in my last campaign, before or since, did I ever state or imply that I would not seek re-election this year. I intend to run on my record and accomplishments, past, present and future, and I sincerely hope any who might oppose me would do the same.

I have chosen Lincoln Day to make my announcement and I think it is appropriate to close my statement, and to invite the questions of the press, by recalling Lincoln's words on duty and responsibility.

Quote: "I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end."

Thank you.

"The Vulnerable Russians"

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the recent episode of Hanoi's attacks in South Vietnam bears all the hallmarks of carefully calculated psychopolitical warfare. In essence, the broad campaign against the cities of South Vietnam was far more psychological and political in objective than military. This is an important lesson for us to learn both in the present and for the future.

The new book of "The Vulnerable Russians" shows the background of this type of warfare in the case of the Soviet Russian totalitarians and, through them and their specialized schools in this warfare, the cases of all other Communist functionaries, including Ho Chi Minh. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky of Georgetown University, the book is simply written, revealing in numerous ways, and consistently documented. With

broad perspective, it shows the foolhardiness of viewing Vietnam, Korea, or any other part of the Red Empire in divorce from the power center; namely, Moscow itself.

"The Vulnerable Russians" is now available at the Georgetown University Bookstore, White Gravenor, Georgetown University, Washington, D.C. However, some excerpts from the book will give the reader an indication of the novel nature of the work.

The excerpts follow:

HISTORICAL OUTLINES OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

"Human history," said H. G. Wells, "is in essence a history of ideas." The history of totalitarian Russian aggression is undoubtedly a major episode of human history and in basic essence sharpens the contrast between the ideas of national and personal freedom and those of imperialist domination and totalitarian control. History, one can say, is philosophy teaching by examples. And the examples we shall consider here are not, as the Kremlin would have it, evidence of any mythical contest between Communism and capitalism but are, instead, evidence of a real contest between Soviet Russian imperialism and colonialism, on the one hand, and national self-determination and personal liberty, on the other. Truly, those who do not know or remember the history of Soviet Russian aggression are condemned to repeat it.

Second, the history of Soviet Russian aggression portrays a genetic development of conquest, predation, and exploitation, without which pure analysis remains sterile. In this respect, our short understanding of this history explains in largest measure our persistent misconceptions of the Soviet Union—as seen, for example, in the absurd use of the term "the Soviets"—as well as our gullibility for skillful Russian propaganda and our constant reactionism to the cold war ventures of the adversary.

Thus a complete and factually grounded history of Soviet Russian imperialism is indispensable to our thoughts and actions in the permanent Cold War staged by Moscow. It is equally necessary for our behavior and operations in any hot global war. This history is the very basis of justification and confirmation of the sound warning given by the renowned Russian philosopher, Nicholas Berdyaev: "It is particularly important for Western minds to understand the national roots of Russian Communism and the fact that it was Russian history which determined its limits and shaped its character. A knowledge of Marxism will not help in this."

THE TSARIST RUSSIAN EMPIRE BACKGROUND

It is an open secret that we Americans are not exactly conspicuous in the areas of historical research, interpretation, and analysis. In fact, until recently, in our schools and in our daily existence we had even shown a disdain for historical inquiry and understanding. With regard to the reality of Soviet Russian aggression, some of us were awakened only when colonist Moscow took to overt means of threat and bluff against the interests of the United States following World War II. It has been of little concern to most of us that by private or official agency we have helped substantially to build up this monster from 1917 to the present, either by commission or omission of various deeds and works.

Every conceivable "Communist" technique today has an able institutional precedent in the empire-building enterprise started by Ivan the Terrible in the sixteenth century. The repertoire includes divide-and-conquer, conspiratorial networks, genocide, Russification, two steps forward and one backward, broken treaties, a self-assuring mystical messianism, smoke screens of totalistic ideologies, political partitionism, the police state, inventions and distortions of history, incitement of class struggles, slave labor, anti-Semitic pogroms, Potemkin Village tactics, "peaceful coexistence"—in brief, the fashioned implements of cold war gaming aimed at eventual conquest.

It is also an experience masked by a succession of deceptive ideologies: the Third Rome doctrine of Orthodox supremacy, racist Pan-Slavism, and materialistic Communism. Where it serves Moscow's purposes, each of these is put into use today. For example, the Morros testimony which led to the Sobel spy case in New York brought out the fact that, as Morros put it, the "Russian plot . . . goes beyond communism. They are for Pan-Slavism on a scale more ambitious than Hitler's fanatical dreams of world conquest." And Morros operated with functionaries on the highest levels of the Kremlin conspiratorial setup.

The Tsarist Russian Empire suffered from the same rebellious upsurge of patriotic nationalism that the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman empires did. We know of the Polish resistance and fight for national freedom in the spirit of Mickiewicz, Kosciuszko, and Pulaski, but how many of us know of the freedom fighters and the resistance against Russian domination elsewhere within the empire? Frankly, few of us are acquainted with the White Ruthenians Kalinovsky and Hrynivetski who assassinated Alexander II in 1881; the Ukrainian Shevchenko and the pervasive spirit of Mazepa in subjugated Ukraine; the jealous independence of the Don and Kuban Cossacks in the spirit of Razin and Pugachov; the freedom star of the Caucasus, Chamyl, and the innumerable revolts of the North Caucasian peoples throughout the nineteenth century; The Muslim Congress of 1905-1906 through which the Turkestani and Azerbaijani formed a religious common front against Russian colonialism.

In marked measure the Russian defeat in the Russo-Japanese War was attributable to the rumblings and dissension of the subjugated non-Russian peoples, and the Revolution of 1905 was in part the explosion of this force of nationalism. A decade later, in World War I, mass desertion of these non-Russian nationals crippled the so-called military steamroller of the Russian Empire. Over two decades later—after a long period of ostensible Communist indoctrination—millions of these non-Russians deserted again, practically placing the platter of victory before the Germans.

Although we still have to uncover and make use of these facts, in the field of experience the Russian Bolsheviks, led by Lenin, knew them well and used them effectively for their own ends. Today, this account would be condemned by Moscow as "the provocations of bourgeois nationalism"; before the collapse of the Tsarist Russian Empire it was accepted by the forthcoming heirs of the empire in the name of national self-determination. "Russian Socialists who fail to demand freedom of secession for Finland, Poland, the Ukraine, etc., etc.—are be-

having like chauvinists, like lackeys of the blood-and-mud stained imperialist monarchies and the imperialist bourgeoisie." So wrote Lenin.

In addition, most students know of the two Russian Revolutions in 1917, but how many of us are aware of the widespread non-Russian Revolutions for national freedom and independence at that time? Yet the significance of these non-Russian Wars of Independence cannot but have profound meaning for us today. Independent national republics were established in area after area: Idel-Ural, November 12, 1917; Finland, December 6, 1917; Ukraine, January 22, 1918; Kuban Cossackia, February 16, 1918; Lithuania, February 16, 1918, followed in that year by Estonia, White Ruthenia, Don Cossackia, North Caucasias, Georgia, Azerbaijan, Armenia, Poland, and Latvia. In Siberia, on April 4, 1920, the Democratic Republic of the Far East was founded, and in Central Asia a republic was proclaimed by Turkestan on April 15, 1922.

FIRST WAVE OF SOVIET RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

As shown in part by the former Select Committee to Investigate Communist Aggression of the U.S. House of Representatives, the history of Red Russian aggression commenced with the onslaught by Trotsky's Red Russian army against most of these non-Russian republics. States like Ukraine and Georgia were subverted, conquered, and made to appear as independent Soviet Republics by the end of 1920. Familiar techniques of "intensive revolution," infiltration, propaganda distortion, espionage, conspiracy, and planted governments had been in full use before the military blow struck. One republic was picked off after another on the traditional basis of divide-and-conquer. By 1923 the first wars between the non-Russian nations and Soviet Russia were over. On January 31, 1924, the forcible incorporation of these many nations into the new prison house of nations was formally declared with the establishment of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. A new Red Russian Empire was now in being.

As we noted earlier, it is little appreciated that the first smashing defeat of the imperialist forces of Soviet Russia was registered in 1920 by the Polish-Ukrainian alliance of Pilsudski and Petlura. If their combined forces had crossed the proper borders of Russia and completely wiped out the Red Russian Army, Europe and the rest of the world would certainly have benefitted from far more than a twenty-year breathing period. As reflections of historical reality many of these "ifs" have pointed meaning for us today.

It is also in this period that so-called Soviet history was punctuated with recurring uprisings, passive resistance, and the mortal danger of "bourgeois nationalism." Witness the uprisings of 1929-30 and the purges of 1935 and 1937 in Georgia, the revolt of the young Turkestani in the Basmachi underground during 1935-41, the armed revolts of the Azerbaijani in 1925, 1929-30, and 1933, and the persistent opposition of the Ukrainians, which caused a Russian satrap, Kossior, to blurt out in 1933 that "Ukrainian nationalism is our chief danger." Aside from revisionism, the greatest and most enduring of crimes in the Soviet Union today is "bourgeois nationalism." For us it is plain national patriotism.

It is also important to remember that without these conquered non-Russian areas Russia and its roughly 110 million people could only be a second or third-rate power. Ukraine by itself stands as the largest non-Russian nation both in the Soviet Union and behind the Iron Curtain. It should be noted, too, that the major economic resources in the USSR are largely concentrated in the non-Russian nations. Turkestan, which Moscow deliberately partitioned into five artificial Central Asiatic republics, and has since exploited severely, literally abounds in diverse natural resources.

SECOND WAVE OF AGGRESSION

The second wave of Soviet Russian aggression was really triggered by Moscow signing a ten-year non-aggression treaty with Berlin on August 24, 1939. The treaty paved the way for the Nazi invasion of Poland. The outbreak of World War II followed, and the opportunity for Russian colonialist expansion presented itself in Poland, Finland, and the Baltic States. The paramount feature of this massive aggression was, of course, the forced incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into Moscow's prison house of nations.

Several histories of World War II have been published, and many still are in process. But still to be written for the benefit of the Free World is the struggle for national freedom in Eastern Europe and Central Asia in the very course of World War II—a saga of invincible will and heroism. While the war gave Soviet Russia the opportunity to extend its colonialism, it also gave the non-Russian captives an equal opportunity to strike for national freedom. Even many freedom-loving Russians saw their opportunity, too. As in World War I, mass desertions from the polyglot multi-national armed forces of the USSR were the order of the time. White Ruthenians, Cossacks, Bashkiri, Georgians, Tatars, Chechens, Ukrainians, and others, who were supposed to be hopelessly indoctrinated by Communism, deserted in the millions in the hope of fighting for the freedom of their lands.

Here, in a nutshell, is the explanation of the unsurpassed political blunder in this century. The German Nazis attempted to foist their type of imperialist totalitarianism upon these non-Russian nations and in reality—fortunately for us—it cost them the war and victory. Throughout this period and, as a matter of fact, up to 1950, the national underground systems of Lithuania, Ukraine, White Ruthenia, Turkestan, and others, engaged in guerrilla warfare against both the Russian and German totalitarians, and later against the Russians and their colonial puppets. Our interest in guerrilla warfare today can well be satisfied by a study of the warfare waged by the Ukrainian Insurgent Army in that period.

The colossal naiveté of some of our leaders was displayed in the Yalta agreements and other unnecessary concessions made to the greatest imperialist power on earth. Up to that time hundreds of agreements, treaties, and promises had been callously broken by colonialist Moscow but, for a variety of reasons, our leaders felt it could not happen to us. The roots of the successive Berlin crises go back to this period, and so does the captivity of many additional non-Russian nations. The causal reasons of ignorance and even degrees of Russophilism still are at work today.

THE THIRD WAVE

Whether by military occupation or by indirect means of the traditional Russian borderlands policy or "intensive revolution," as seen more recently in Cuba, South Vietnam, and the Dominican Republic, the process of aggression and the end result of conquest and domination of a people are the same. Satraps in most of these areas are Moscow-bred, and although differences have arisen—as in the cases of captive Poland, satellite Yugoslavia, the junior partner Red China, or rascal Albania—who can logically deny that the permanence of the unrepresentative regimes in any of these areas is inseparably bound up with the strength and future of their originator, Soviet Russia? Aggression by indirection was shown in Korea in 1950; it is at work in different stages on all five continents.

The world's masters in empire-building continue to reap incremental successes of indirect aggression, despite our alliances, the United Nations, the horrendous presence of nuclear weapons, and the Maginot Wall of containment. By the use of Moscow's traditional argument of no interference in "internal affairs," by skillful propaganda inducing fears of war, and by gaining sanctuary from us in the consolidation of their vast empire, they have a free field for subversion, infiltration, and indirect aggression in the non-totalitarian Free World. The words of Admiral William H. Standley, our former Ambassador to the USSR, are as pertinent today as they were over a decade ago: "Over the ancient skeleton of Russian imperialism, Lenin and Stalin threw a cloak of Communist ideology, but the bones show through. Even as in Czarist times, when the Russian Bear stands on its hind feet with its front paws held up as if in prayer, we must beware of the Bear that walks like a Man."

The policy of liberation, accurately construed, is inescapable for our country if we are determined to survive as an independent nation. In addition to the given quantity of armed protection, the greatest weapon we have is the captive nations of Europe and Asia. The case of Hungary proved our failure to implement this policy, not the inefficacy of the policy itself. With good reason, there is nothing more frightening to Moscow than a developing concentration by us on the numerous captive non-Russian nations within the USSR itself. The image of Russian power can be changed overnight with such concentration on Russian colonialism and imperialism within the USSR—and with enormous impact on Asia, Africa and Latin America. Many of us still have not pondered well the question, "Why was it that Khrushchev, sitting on a pile of missiles and nuclear bombs and boasting about economic progress and the victory of Communism, almost suffered apoplexy when Congress passed the Captive Nations Week Resolution in 1959?" The answer is found in the call for this kind of concentration.

Paradoxically enough, Marx recognized a century ago the same problem that faces us today: "They will have learned before that the idea of Russian diplomatic supremacy owes its efficiency to the imbecility and the timidity of the Western nations, and that the belief in Russia's superior military power is hardly less a delusion. . . . There is only one way to deal with a Power like Russia, and that is the fearless way." The fearless way, however, presupposes no abysmal gaps in our knowledge of the enemy. Let us now consider some of these cultural gaps in our armor of understanding.

Imperialism, Russian Style

HON. THOMAS M. REES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, on this anniversary of George Washington's Birthday I think it appropriate to remember the plight of the Baltic peoples in Lithuania. An excellent statement of the tragedy of this country and its loss of freedom is expressed in an editorial published in the Los Angeles Times on February 15, 1968. The editorial follows:

IMPERIALISM, RUSSIAN STYLE

As part of their unceasing campaign to win power and influence among the underdeveloped countries, Kremlin propagandists never tire of boasting that Russia is an implacable foe of imperialism and a dedicated champion of "self-determination."

Yet Moscow brusquely dismisses any suggestion that the non-Russian peoples within the Soviet Union are entitled to determine their own national destinies, too.

To call attention to this massive Soviet exercise in hypocrisy, organizations representing some 1 million Americans of Lithuanian descent have proclaimed 1968 as "Lithuanian Fight for Freedom Year." Similar observances are being carried out by this country's Latvians and Estonians.

If they expect to generate any significant pressures on the Soviet Union, they are likely to be disappointed.

They won't get much sympathy at the United Nations, for example, because a majority of the members is unable to comprehend that white Europeans can be victims of imperialism, too.

The same disability unfortunately afflicts a lot of American and European liberals who wax indignant at colonial injustices in places like Angola, but wouldn't dream of demanding plebiscites within the Communist orbit.

Actually, the Russians are old hands at imperialism.

During the 400 years preceding World War I, Russia expanded at an average rate of 50 square miles a day. Thus, by the time the Bolsheviks seized power in 1917, the czar's empire consisted of a dominant core of Russians and a whole host of subject peoples—Ukrainians, Poles, Balts, Armenians, Georgians, Turks, Uzbeks, Kazakhs, etc.

The Kremlin is fond of saying that Russian imperialism died with the czar. But the fate of the Baltic nations—Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia—shows this to be a cruel fiction.

Lenin's Bolshevik government formally recognized the independence and sovereignty of all three in 1920 peace treaties, thus ending 120 years of Russian rule.

As a consequence of Stalin's deal with Hitler, however, the Red army invaded the Baltic countries in June, 1940.

In Lithuania all non-Communist political parties were outlawed and a puppet parliament "elected" which thereupon petitioned for incorporation into the Soviet Union.

The same kind of fate befell Latvia and Estonia.

After World War II, 30,000 Lithuanian partisans lost their lives in futile resistance to Soviet rule. Hundreds of thousands of others were imprisoned or moved to other parts of the Soviet Union. A deliberate policy of Russification was begun—and continues to this day.

No one can say for sure what would happen if the Kremlin allowed the Baltic peoples

to choose freely now between independence and allegiance to Moscow—a right which is supposedly guaranteed by the Soviet constitution.

But one thing is clear. Russia's chest-thumping champions of "self-determination" have no intention of putting it to the test.

Henry S. Koster and Equal Economic Rights

HON. THEODORE R. KUPFERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. KUPFERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am so pleased to inform my colleagues of the fact that public-spirited citizens can and do assist in the movement for equal rights for all of our citizens.

The attached letter from my constituent, Huntington M. Turner, details one such important movement, and the New York Times article of December 17, 1968, which follows gives further evidence of it.

Mr. Henry S. Koster is to be commended on his foresight and public service:

H. S. KOSTER & Co., INC.,
New York, N.Y., January 19, 1968.

HON. T. R. KUPFERMAN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KUPFERMAN: When I retired as a Vice President of Chemical Bank New York Trust Company after thirty-seven years with that institution, under our pension plan, approximately four years ago, I joined my old friend, Henry S. Koster, whom I had first known in the banking business in Newark in 1925. We had also been associated together at Chemical Bank but he resigned to organize his own company and became a financial consultant.

A colored couple whom he employs, asked him to help a couple of their friends start in business. He thought about this, studied the situation and finally organized a group known as the Association to Assist Negro Business, which was publicized in the Times under date of December 17th. I am enclosing a copy of the article which I am sure you will be interested in reading.

Mr. Koster worked out all of the details, got thirteen guarantors and five or six others who put up money to run the office. They expect the Association to become self-supporting in the future when the business that they finance are successful, as they will pay a certain amount of their profits into a reserve fund for future failures. The Association has set up a Board of Directors composed entirely of Negroes who will screen all applications. These Directors are important individuals in the community. The Association has made an arrangement with the Freedom National Bank to make loans to approved applicants. Aubrey Edwards, who at one time was Executive Director of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity is in charge of the Association's office which is located in Harlem at 271 West 125th Street.

After the reserve fund has been built up, there will be no need for guarantors and the Association will then stand on its own feet and be run entirely by Negroes.

I thought you would be interested in knowing about this as I am one of your con-

stituents and the Association has its headquarters in Harlem. In my opinion, Mr. Koster should be commended for his leadership in organizing the Association and I feel that gestures such as this will go a long way in helping to minimize and perhaps eliminate riots.

Your opinions of the contents of this letter would be appreciated and while I am not asking you to do so, if you should, after investigating, enter this in the Congressional Record, I would appreciate your sending me a copy.

Sincerely yours,

HUNTINGTON M. TURNER.

[From the New York Times, Dec. 17, 1967]

GROUP IS HELPING NEGRO BUSINESSES

(By Leonard Sloane)

Robert Mickle is a 28-year-old former employee of the Transit Authority who wanted to buy a gas station. Connie Patterson is a 35-year-old saleswoman at a uniform shop who dreamed but never hoped of owning the store. And Joseph Muller, at age 59, had extensive experience in selling women's ready-to-wear and wanted to expand his horizons.

All three are Negroes and all three did not have the collateral required by a bank for a loan to start a small company. Nevertheless, all three are about to begin operating their own businesses thanks to an unusual organization that is less than a year old.

The name of this non-profit group describes its function: The Association to Assist Negro Business. Its 12-member board consists of Negroes and is headed by Rose Morgan, head of Rose Morgan Enterprises, which sells a line of cosmetics and operates a beauty shop. Its salaried president and also a board member is Aubrey H. Edwards, a young graduate of Morgan State College.

But an integral part of the concept is a group of white businessmen who, in effect, cosign the bank loans arranged by the association.

THIRTEEN GUARANTORS

At present there are 13 guarantors working with the organization. Each has signed a power of attorney authorizing a representative of the association to commit him as a backer of the loans that have been arranged individually. If the business fails or the owner cannot repay the money, then the guarantors are liable up to a maximum of \$10,000 over a 10-year period.

"The whole idea came about from a pure need because there seemed to be no actual way that a Negro starting a business could get bank financing," Mr. Edwards said. "This project tries to deal with the experience and the collateral—the two things that influence commercial financing."

"This is a fundamental and ingenious answer to the key problem of developing economic opportunities for Negro businessmen," said Lawrence S. Phillips, president of the Phillips Van Heusen Corporation and one of the present guarantors. "It struck me as being a fascinating, yet simple, solution that I had never heard of before."

Working closely with the association in its program is the Freedom National Bank. The bank, like the association and many of the association and many of the individuals who have received the guaranteed loans, is in Harlem. And Freedom National's president, William R. Hudgins, sees the entire effort as a means of improving economic conditions in that area.

"I think this is one of the more meaningful ways those who have expressed an interest in the economic development of the Harlem community can be effective," he added. "It's putting your money where your mouth is."

The bank is participating in this project to an extent that goes beyond making normal business loans. "At such time that these individuals have exhibited substantial progress in their business, the bank will free up the guarantors," Mr. Hudgins said. "Then their guarantees can be used in connection with other loans."

What do the small businessmen who participate in the program think of it all?

"It's very good for the community," said James Ray Lewis, a 36-year-old businessman whose S. & J. Demolition, Inc., received one of the four loans that have been authorized under the program since it began in November. The demolition contracting organizations established by Mr. Lewis in September received a \$21,000 loan at 7 per cent which enabled it to bid on a \$30,700-wrecking job for a building owned by Columbia University on West 115th Street.

"I realize that if my father had a chance like this, he would have been able to get much further in life," declared Mr. Mickle, whose Shell service station will open in the Bronx on Wednesday. "It's a wonderful opportunity for a black man to get an economic chance in this country."

In contrast to Mr. Mickle, who is just beginning in his field, Mr. Muller has 34 years of experience in selling apparel. He started as a porter and worked up to assistant display manager, display manager, assistant manager and manager.

In two months, Mr. Muller will open a Lady Van Heusen shop on 125th Street, Harlem's main thoroughfare. He hopes to achieve a volume of \$80,000 in his first year of operation and his opening inventory will be about \$12,000 at cost.

"This whole concept is something that's been long overdue," he said. "It's unbelievable that people can be so altruistic."

EMPLOYEES TRAINED

The beneficiaries of association-guaranteed loans also feel that they are helping to run the program because of the two commitments they undertake along with their participation. Everyone agrees to train some of his employees so that they eventually will have the experience to manage and possibly own similar businesses in the future. And those who achieve financial success will be asked to help support the association in its future endeavors.

The Association to Assist Negro Business has been financed temporarily since its incorporation last January by contributions from directors, guarantors and others. The group now hopes for financial assistance from a foundation and is looking forward to the time when the people it has helped can make contributions of their own.

Meanwhile, Mr. Edwards, former executive director of the Interracial Council for Business Opportunity of New York, is keeping everything going with his enthusiasm and faith in the idea that more Negro-owned businesses are essential to the development of greater initiative and enterprise among a large segment of the population.

"We want to develop more participants in the marketplace," he said. "We find it most difficult. But it must be done. We want to help 15 new businesses get started next year. We'll work with them very closely as no government organization that assists small businesses can."

"You know, although this program is very heavily laden with social and emotional things, it's very business laden too. We don't ever want to have to draw on our guarantors. And we're all very much aware of the responsibilities we have to make this whole thing work."

Civil Disobedience or Due Process of Law?

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a very real social issue is presented by the question of civil disobedience.

We are a government of laws and of ordered change through elections and the political process. However, there have been times in our history, both past and recent, in which Americans have employed the techniques of civil disobedience to bring change in the social order. Whether this is right is a question we must all concern ourselves with.

A distinguished and accomplished judge, the Honorable Lyle E. Cook, has written a provocative and interesting article for the Stanford Alumni Almanac on this question. He asks, "Civil Disobedience or Due Process of Law?"

Judge Cook's exposition and his answer, like the question itself are worthy of a good deal of thought.

Under unanimous consent I submit Mr. Cook's article for inclusion in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL DISOBEDIENCE OR DUE PROCESS OF LAW?

(By Lyle E. Cook, '29, judge of the Superior Court, County of Alameda, State of California)

"No man is above the law and no man is below it."

—THEODORE ROOSEVELT, 1903

(NOTE.—Lyle E. Cook, '29, has been a judge of the Alameda County Superior Court since 1961 and earlier served on the Oakland-Piedmont Municipal Court bench. He received his law degree from the University of California and practiced in the East Bay prior to his judicial appointment. With the Judge Advocate General's Department during World War II, he remained in the Reserves until his retirement in 1962. Judge Cook has many civic and professional affiliations and has retained a deep interest in Stanford through participation in programs such as the Summer Alumni College. He and his wife Eleene are the parents of two grown sons.)

It has been said that one man alone on an island needs no law, but two do. And it is further said that if a woman joins them they need a whole system of jurisprudence.

Whether the latter is true or not we do have a whole system of jurisprudence embraced by our unique federal system of Constitutional law. By it our affairs are guided from the moment of conception to well beyond the day of final entombment. Our lives, our fortunes, and often our honor are in large measure determined by this legal structure.

This system is the product of no one man nor of a single generation of men. It has come down to us through the long processes of Western civilization, and we are continuing its evolution and refinement every day through our legislatures and our courts. Indeed, the whole history of the United States has involved the enlargement of human rights and human freedom through the social processes of our Constitutional form of government.

In accepting his second nomination to the presidency, Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke these prophetic words: "There is a mysterious cycle in human events. To some generations much

is given; of other generations much is expected. This generation of Americans has a rendezvous with destiny."

The generation to which Franklin D. Roosevelt spoke over 30 years ago had shared the ravages of the Great Depression. Unrest, born of joblessness, mortgage foreclosures, and general economic stagnation throughout the country, had posed grave questions about the future of Constitutional government.

The present generation of Americans has more goods, more services, more provision for individual rights and freedoms than any other in the long history of mankind. Our affluent society has provided new goals for our hopes and new boundaries for our expectations.

Despite these obvious advances, a persistent unrest is being manifested at all levels of our body politic. Grave concerns about events at home and abroad are creating a complex of frustrated human behavior. Sharp conflicts have divided our people between the dove and the hawk, the liberal and the conservative, the advantaged and the disadvantaged. Complaints about the "Establishment" and the "Power Structure" come from many of the critics of present-day America.

In an era of such unrest it may be of benefit to examine the stresses and strains which these current phenomena are imposing upon our system of jurisprudence. It may also be well to sound a warning to those leaders of mass movements who seem so unconcerned about their potential for the destruction of that system.

Today, *ad hoc* committees formed by a wide assortment of persons for a wide assortment of purposes are posing serious questions involving the rights and duties of individuals under our Constitutional system.

The most recent and most disturbing incidents, at this writing, have been those organized by various groups which oppose the foreign policy of the United States in Vietnam. A generous assortment of "activists" has found common cause in a determination to force a withdrawal of our troops from that unhappy and disheveled country.

Mass movements involving thousands of people under the direction of one or more of these seemingly ephemeral *ad hoc* committees have descended on draft induction centers in several large cities with the announced intention of disrupting their function. These thousands have included leaders from the professions, a generous sprinkling of high school and college students, and a general miscellany which always seems to be available in moments of disorder.

Draft card burnings have been elevated to the apparent status of religious sacraments with the advice and consent of prominent clergymen.

These events have frequently involved a calculated intent to violate laws duly enacted pursuant to the Constitution of the United States.

The philosophy underlying these defiant acts and precepts is currently characterized by its partisans as the doctrine of "Civil Disobedience."

This euphemism apparently originated with Henry David Thoreau over a century ago. In his essay entitled *Civil Disobedience*, first published in 1849, he advanced his theory that men sell themselves into perpetual bondage by conforming to the traditional ways of the world.

Thoreau, who has been best known as a naturalist, did not limit his dislike of the ways of the world to the proclivities of mankind in the direction of war. He opposed "government" in general and all governments in particular. "That government is best which governs not at all," he wrote. He cheerfully went to jail rather than pay his taxes. He doubted the validity of the outcome of elec-

tions, stating that "there is but little virtue in the action of the masses of men." He felt no common cause with any political majority and preferred to think of himself as the only majority he wished to recognize.

In short, Thoreau preached a kind of solipsism. In his *Civil Disobedience* he summed up his philosophy in one significant sentence:

"In fact, I quietly declare war with the state, after my fashion, though I will still make what use and get what advantage of her I can, as is usual in such cases."

Thoreau was a member of a New England group of ministers and writers which was devoted to the ethical probings of the great German philosopher Immanuel Kant. Called Transcendentalists, the group also experimented with various kinds of Utopian living in communal societies.

It is hard to reconcile Thoreau's theories of Civil Disobedience with Kant's categorical imperative, central to his ethical concepts, which proclaimed, "Act as if the maxim from which you act were to become through your will a universal law of nature."

The present crop of "activists" is not the first group to espouse the philosophy of Thoreau. The Ku Klux Klan "demonstrated" in behalf of its "beliefs" from the years following the Civil War up to the present. It, too, has declared war on the state.

The philosophy that "the end justifies the means" has a superficial attractiveness. It appealed to the late Senator Joseph McCarthy and his adherents in the 1950s in much the same manner as it appeals to the leaders of marches on induction centers in the 1960s.

This theory also sanctions the sit-ins in college administration buildings seeking to prevent representatives of currently disfavored industries from interviewing student applicants for employment.

While the concept of disobedience to law was certainly not original with Thoreau, his use of the word *Civil* as a modifier has produced some semantic uncertainty. The same uncertainties would appear in the terms "civil wife-beater" and "civil rapist."

There is, of course, no legal or Constitutional basis for the concept of Civil Disobedience whether its handy solutions are employed by the political right, the political left, or the political middle. It does not give sanction to the violations of law by any group, ecclesiastical or profane.

The concept of "due process of law" in Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence surely predates the Magna Carta, where King John was required to promise to observe "the law of the land." The term itself was used in the statutes of Edward III in 1355 in almost the precise language in which it is found in the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments.

There is not room in this publication for any sufficient discussion of the meanings inherent in the term. No full and final definition of its wide embrace has ever been accomplished. "That kind of procedure is *due process of law* which is suitable and proper to the case and sanctioned by the established customs and usages of the Courts," the United States Supreme Court stated in an early opinion. Under its general concept of fundamental fairness it signifies a right to be present at proceedings, to be heard, to present evidence, to confront opponents and know their claims, and to have controversies decided by impartial tribunals. The term implies that laws shall not be arbitrary or capricious and that means selected to enforce them shall have real and substantial relation to that object. It has been described as "of the very essence of ordered liberty."

Due Process, thus, invites concepts such as the right to counsel and a speedy and public trial; prohibitions against double

jeopardy, forced self-incriminatory testimony, and unlawful searches and seizures. On the other hand, Civil Disobedience can be realistically associated only with the vagaries and excesses of *ad hoc* committees spawned tonight and disbanded the day after tomorrow.

Due Process contemplates a permanent structure of orderly, predictable, and accountable government. Civil Disobedience contemplates ultimate anarchy.

It would be beneficial for those persons who wish America well to remember that the same Constitution which commands that no person shall be deprived "of life, liberty, or property without due process of law" also provides that the Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies," and "to provide and maintain a navy," and that "the President shall be commander-in-chief of the Army and Navy."

This same Constitution which, in the First Amendment, proscribes any abridgement of the freedom of speech or of the press or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble also states, "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof . . . shall be the supreme law of the land . . ."

The same courts which are charged with the recognition of all the rights under the Constitution are also charged with the enforcement of all of the duties. The option to comply only with selected portions of law and constitutions is not extended to president, governors, legislators, or judges. Should it be extended to anyone?

It is no little thing to act individually in defiance of the supreme law of the land. It is an act of monstrous proportions to advise and encourage others so to act.

But such defiance is being urged and practiced in these troubled times by persons of presumed maturity and in exalted positions from which they exert unusual influence.

Sometimes the proponents of Civil Disobedience cite historical examples such as the Boston Tea Party as justification for their extralegal efforts. It is submitted that this is a fallacious comparison. King George III, against whom the Boston patriots were rebelling, obviously provided a quite different form of government for Colonial America. Citizens of the United States now enjoy all of the facilities of the ballot box to effect changes in their government and in their governors. These facilities provide the machinery for orderly and effective change to reflect the will of the majority and to afford the views of minorities a hearing. None of these prevailed under George III.

The same can be said for historical protests against the rule of ancient Rome by early Christians, where government by the consent of the governed was an unknown principle.

The willful violation of any penal law is a crime. It is no defense that a law was violated in a cause or for a purpose the defendant asserts to be meritorious. Civil Disobedience thus becomes criminal disobedience.

This unhappy discovery was recently noted by a well-known folk-singer and disciple of Thoreau when he observed, "I was trying to disturb the war and I wound up in jail for disturbing the peace—does that make sense?"

An affirmative answer to this rhetorical question was given recently by the United States Supreme Court, which stated that an individual cannot escape from social constraint merely by asserting that he is engaged in political talk or action.

There are wide avenues of thought, speech, and action open to those who wish to express their dissent with any policy of their government. The principles of freedom of speech, of the press, of the rights of people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the government

for a redress of grievances are not empty phrases. They are not optional indulgences by a whimsical government.

These principles and rights are backed by the full power of the three branches of the government and are equally binding on each branch. The Supreme Court has stated that a "function of free speech under our system of government is to invite dispute. It may indeed best serve its high purpose when it induces a condition of unrest, creates dissatisfaction with conditions as they are, or even stirs people to anger."

Thus, peaceful assemblies for the purpose of advocacy of points of view, peaceful picketing, peaceful parades, and any number of other peaceful events come under the Constitutional umbrella erected by the First Amendment.

Emphasis must be placed on the word *peaceful*. There are limits to these freedoms and rights as there must be to all individual actions if an orderly society is to be maintained. Mr. Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes noted 50 years ago: "The most stringent protection of free speech would not protect a man in falsely shouting 'fire' in a theater and causing panic. The question in every case is whether the words used are used in such circumstances and are of such a nature as to create a clear and present danger that they will bring about the evils that Congress has a right to prevent." Significantly, this language was used in the famous *Schenck* case involving the counseling of violation of the draft laws of World War I.

Freedom of speech and assembly do not extend to the blocking of entrances to public buildings by the bodies of large numbers of people assembled to deny access to persons having lawful business therein. They do not extend to the public utterances of obscenities, as a young man from Berkeley recently learned from a California Appellate Court. They do not extend to violence or physically oppressive behavior. They do not extend to the limits implied by the doctrine of Civil Disobedience and claimed by many of its current disciples.

It would seem, however, that ample latitude remains for all scholarly utterances and endeavors. Most people would even say that theological exhortations would not be unduly inhibited by any of these restrictions. To the great majority of our people these notions of violence and physical oppression seem strangely inappropriate in political, academic, or spiritual discourse.

It is also worthy of note that large numbers of arrests resulting from mob actions aroused by the advocates of Civil Disobedience have created a severe strain on the courts. Criminal trials, under the Constitution, must be held promptly and they take precedence over most other matters before the courts. Thus, claims for personal injuries and contractual obligations, along with other types of civil actions, have in some cases been delayed for many months because no judge was available to hear them. To the thousands of people involved this is a serious deprivation of a right to which they, too, are entitled.

There is an old maxim in the law of Equity that "he who seeks Equity must do Equity." This has come down to us from the old Ecclesiastical Courts of Chancery in England. It is still the law in most jurisdictions of this country. This maxim stems from the paramount principle that the law of Equity is the law of conscience. It means that a court will not grant equitable relief to a party to a lawsuit unless that party makes provision for the equitable demands of his adversary.

While this principle does not operate to deprive any person of his Constitutional rights, it seems reasonable to expect that men of good will and academic probity would agree that one who seeks due process

of law from his government should, in all conscience, abide by due process of law in his own conduct. To do otherwise is to invite the disruption of our society.

"The Constitutional guarantee of liberty," wrote former Supreme Court Justice Goldberg, "implies the existence of an organized society maintaining public order, without which liberty itself would be lost in the excesses of anarchy."

If in our zeal for easy solutions to hard problems we ignore the inseparability of our laws and our Constitution we shall, in the words of Abraham Lincoln, "tear the charter of our own and our children's liberty."

This generation of Americans, indeed, has a rendezvous with destiny.

Special Bulk Mailing Rate for Neighborhood Groups

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 22, 1968

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a bill, H.R. 15533, to amend title 39 of the United States Code in order to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations.

In recent years, Mr. Speaker, there has been a spectacular growth in neighborhood improvement groups in some parts of the country. Permit me to use my district, which coincides with the city of Minneapolis, as an example of such growth.

The last 5 years have seen a huge increase in neighborhood improvement associations in Minneapolis. More than 40 organizations are now actively involved in efforts to maintain and develop the family-residential character of the Minneapolis central city that has lost too many young, productive families to the suburbs.

Virtually every residential area in the city has its own neighborhood group that promotes local public improvements, encourages property upkeep and provides a "watchdog" service for zoning changes.

Three years ago, many of these groups banded together to organize a city-wide association of neighborhood groups. The Council of Community Councils, as the organization came to be known, has been a strong force for neighborhood development in Minneapolis. The council was instrumental in the passage of a statewide "dilapidated buildings" law which gave municipalities authority to demolish abandoned, dilapidated structures. More recently, the council successfully worked for an amendment to the Minneapolis housing code which made exterior maintenance of buildings a code item.

The new Federal urban legislation of the last few years has given neighborhood groups new opportunities as well as new responsibilities. Many groups are now deeply involved in Department of Housing and Urban Development and Office of Economic Opportunity projects. The Northside Federation of Community

Groups, for example, organized the area-wide election for directors of the new pilot center, a multiagency project which will coordinate more than \$2 million worth of services for the residents of north Minneapolis. Recently, the Minneapolis City Council named representatives from 10 south Minneapolis groups to organize the policy and planning committee for Minneapolis' model neighborhood.

These new Federal programs have made it necessary for the neighborhood groups to make mailings more frequently and to larger numbers of people in the neighborhoods. The success of efforts such as model neighborhoods will depend in large part on the understanding that neighborhood residents have of these programs. Thus far, the Minneapolis groups have done an excellent job of informing their residents about the new programs. During the past year, community groups have sponsored hundreds of meetings, circulated thousands of newsletters and even rented a billboard in an effort to inform residents about proposals for new programs.

The communication function of the groups has been severely limited, however, by current postal regulations. Under existing law, neighborhood associations do not have special third-class bulk mailing privileges which would allow the groups to mail at the rate of 1.4 cents per piece. This means that all neighborhood group mail must be sent at the new regular third-class rate of 6 cents per 2 ounces. For private, nonprofit neighborhood associations, the 6-cent rate provides a real financial burden. The Jordan Area Action Committee, for example, would like to notify all the residents of a 65-square-block area about a proposed code enforcement project. But current postal rates make such a mailing prohibitively expensive.

There is real value in the independent nature of these organizations. Because of the informal, grassroots nature of these groups, they have an easier time gaining the trust of their neighborhood than does an official Government agency. Even with their new responsibilities, the neighborhood groups are not asking for direct Government subsidies. Many groups feel that they can operate most effectively by maintaining their independent source of financing.

Although Federal funds are not needed for neighborhood associations, the Government can provide a small but significant encouragement to the associations by extending to them the use of the special third-class mailing permit that is now available to a wide range of nonprofit educational and welfare organizations.

The text of my bill follows:

H.R. 15533

A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to extend to neighborhood improvement organizations or associations the special third-class bulk mail rates for nonprofit organizations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4452(d) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out "for fraternal or-

